

RA
HX
86
E2

UC-NRLF



\$B 268 942

A PLAIN ANALYSIS OF SOCIALISM

BY

L. F. ECCLES

Author of "The Trumpet Voice From the Throne." (Vol. II)




PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR
PULLMAN, WASH.

PRICE 25 CENTS

Postage (extra) 5 "

10 copies, \$2.00; 25 copies, \$4.50; } Plus shipping charges
50 copies, \$8.00; 90 copies, \$15.00; }

IN MEMORIAM



JESSICA PEIXOTTO
1864 - 1941

VOL. I

A PLAIN ANALYSIS OF SOCIALISM

BY

L. F. ECCLES

Author of "The Trumpet Voice From the Throne." (Vol. II)



PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR
PULLMAN, WASH.

PRICE	-	-	-	-	-	25 CENTS
Postage (extra)	-	-	-	-	-	5 "

10 copies, \$2.00;	25 copies, \$4.50;	} Plus shipping charges
50 copies, \$8.00;	100 copies, \$15.00;	

Copyright, 1907, by L. F. ECCLES

IN MEMORIAM
JESSICA PEIXOTTO

TO MY
NEARLY

THE CO-OPERATIVE PRESS, 15 SPRUCE ST., NEW YORK



Preface

My Dear Reader: You who are busy, whose energies have been taxed heavily by much work, manual or mental, and perhaps more heavily by that interminable worry that arises from a feeling of uncertainty; or you who for want of opportunity, inclination or any other cause, have not become familiar with the history of the past nor studied carefully the philosophy of human events, it is for you especially that these pages are intended and to you that they are addressed.

It is needless to say that this work is not intended as a great literary production; for its perusal will easily disclose to a critic the fact that it is not. And if the style should seem abrupt or coarse to those of refined literary taste, I trust that they will bear with and excuse it; for, above all things, I desire to be thoroughly understood by all. To this end there are two things necessary: First, that I write plainly; and secondly, that you read carefully. How well I have done my part you may judge. Will you do your part? And, if, from any cause you fail to get the full meaning, will you do yourself and me the justice to re-read carefully? A certain order has been pursued, so that a thorough understanding of any portion depends largely on a knowledge of what has gone before. I have not hesitated to use the pronouns "I" or "me," as the case may be, and, to relieve the monotony, have frequently called in the editorial "we."

Every trade has its shop talk, which is easily understood by all those of that trade, but Greek to those without. Literary men have theirs. I have been careful to avoid indulging in the use of literary shop talk.

My purpose in the present work is to present a brief, plain, simple yet full, comprehensive and philosophical view of the whole subject in its essential features. While I desire to be brief, I do not wish to sacrifice clearness for brevity, and so, in dealing with topics that seemed important, I have not hesitated to introduce elaborate illustration.

If I have given a greater prominence to the moral phase of the subject than most Socialist writers, I have no apologies to make, for I believe that notwithstanding the tendency of capitalism to uproot, obliterate and destroy it, man still has a conscience, to which the message of Socialism, if properly presented, will appeal. I have quoted freely from other authors wherever I found it convenient, because my object is

not so much to bring forth that which is new as to present a complete case that cannot be upset.

I hope this work may not prove unworthy the consideration of the learned; but my one fixed and settled purpose has been to present to the great plain people, of whom I am one, a book which, when one has read, he will be ready to say, "I am a socialist." Or, if he is a conservative, doubting Thomas, will at least comprehend the Socialist idea so thoroughly, that if he is still hesitating and doubting when the majority vote to inaugurate the Socialistic state, he will be ready to exclaim, "My shoulder to the wheel! I voted against Socialism because I feared to try the experiment; but it is right in principle, and now, since it is to be tried, I desire to see it succeed; I have as much interest in its success as any one; and if it should fail I am determined that it shall be through no fault of mine."

When you get the Socialist idea in all its fullness, there will come with it the Socialist ideal in all its beauty and attractiveness. You may cast it from you as chimerical, visionary and too good to think of; you may trample it under your feet; but it will rise and climb, and keep climbing till it sits enthroned, the ruling impulse of your life. I have almost entirely avoided statistics. Books of these are easily obtained by those who desire to consult them. My object is not so much to tell the reader something he does not already know, as to reason with him upon information that he already has, or may easily obtain. This is intended to be a book of reasons rather than a book of facts.

THE AUTHOR.

IMPORTANT

Unless specially arranged otherwise, all orders for books should be sent to

L. F. ECCLES,

PULLMAN,

WASHINGTON.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

I. INTRODUCTION.	
Fundamental Principles — Selfish, Unselfish. — Primitive Forms—Savagery, Slavery, Serfdom, Capitalism.....	7
II. COMMERCE.	
Primitive Arts.—Division of Labor.—Exchange.—The Competitive System.—Competition.—Public Conscience..	12
III. THE TRUST.	
The Great Comet.—The Swallowing Process.—Shameful Misuse of Wealth (Moffett).....	20
IV. REVIEW OF PRESENT CONDITIONS.	
The Bright Side.—Machinery.—Log Cabin Days and Methods.—The Dark Page.—Panics.....	24
V. REVIEW OF PRESENT CONDITIONS (Continued).	
Rule of Concentrated Wealth (Moffett).—Evolution of a Young Man.—Two Idle Classes.—What of the Future?—Standard Oil (Lawson).....	31
VI. GLANCING BACKWARD AND FORWARD.	
The Finger of God.—Comparison of Injuries of Exploitation.—Society Ripe for a Change.—No Turning Back.—Danger of Anarchy.—In the Niagara River.....	42
VII. ORIGIN AND DEFINITIONS OF SOCIALISM.	
Frances E. Willard on Socialism.—Prof. Ely's Definition and Arrangement.— what is Not Socialism —Anarchism, Communism, Unionism.	47
VIII. SOCIAL REFORM.	
Social Reform in England.—Social Reform in New Zealand.—Prof. Ely's Program of Social Reform.—The Two Principles.—Competition, Co-operation.—Shortness of "Socialistic" Legislation.—Socialism more practicable than Social Reform.—The Hawks and Eagles.....	58
IX. THE PRACTICABILITY OF SOCIALISM.	
Scope of the Subject.—Importance.—Intricacy.—Necessity for Patience	72
X. JUSTICE AND BENEVOLENCE OF SOCIALISM.	
Misapprehension.—Sacredness of Property Rights as an Educator of Conscience.—People better than their Principles.—"Vested Rights."—Discussion of Fundamental Moral Principles.—A Great Emergency.....	73
XI. ACQUIRING POSSESSION.	
Taking Possession.—Four Methods.—Completeness of Plutocracy's Title.—Confiscation.—Gradual Process vs. Rapid Movement.—"Muck Rake Speech."—Proposal to Abolish Constitutions.—Basis of Right of Taxation.—"Great Unrest."	83
XII. LAW, ORDER AND ORGANIZATION.	
Cross Action Produces Anarchy, Parallel Action, Harmony.—Competition Anarchistic, Co-operation Concerted Action.—Development of Organization.—Public Ownership.—Increased Exchange of Services produces Necessity for Industrial Organization.—Blocking the Road to Progress.—Society a Machine.—Depending on the Politician as a Specialist.....	90
XIII. THE SOCIALIST PROGRAM.	
Socialism with the Old Method of Organization.—The More Practicable New Method.—Eradication of Local	

	Self Interests.—Organization from the Bottom Upward (Gronlund), (Vail).—Waste of Capitalism and Economies of Socialism.—The New Standard—Moral Excellence instead of Financial Excellence.....	102
XIV.	DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPATIONS AND POPULATIONS. Bellamy's Plan.—Craving for Distinction.—Elimination of the Great Leader.—Advantages of Equal Wages.—Distribution of Population.—The Race Question.—Universal Peace.	113
XV.	INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION. Raw Material.—Mining.—Money.—Lumbering and Fishing.—Manufacture.—Machinery.—Furniture and Clothing.—Food.—Water, Light and Heat.—Transportation, etc.—Decadence of the Great City.—Increased Use of Railways.—Distribution.	122
XVI.	AGRICULTURE. Inclination of the Farmer.—Individualistic Methods.—Large Scale Methods.—Bonanza Farming.—Electricity and Future Machinery.—Science.—Individualistic Waste and Socialistic Savings.	133
XVII.	PHYSICAL CULTURE UNDER SOCIALISM. Physical Development and Health.—Medical Practice Now, and Then.	140
XVIII.	SOCIAL AND INTELLECTUAL CULTURE UNDER SOCIALISM. The Happy Mean—the Village.—Stimulating Effects of Great Movements.—Discovery of America.—The Reformation.—The American Declaration of Independence.—Abolition of Slavery.—“No Incentive.”—Inventive Genius (Dewy).—Removal of Trammels from Educational Field.—Vanity.—Sweat Shop Methods.	142
XIX.	MORAL INFLUENCES UNDER SOCIALISM. Socialism a Moral Movement.—Present Demoralizing Effects of Taxation (Ely).—Subsidized Vices—The Liquor Traffic, The Social Evil.—The Family (Vail).—Religion Under Socialism.	152
XX.	THE CLASS STRUGGLE. The Two Great Parties, Capital and Labor.—Counter Claims and Charges.—The Right Side.—Whole Controversy Product of Capitalism; hence not Vital to Socialism.—Environment of Each Party.—Crimes charged against Each.—Labor Troubles in the West.—Socialism the Issue.	158
XXI.	GOVERNMENTAL ALIGNMENT WITH WEALTH. Sectional Views.—Justice McKenna's Opinion in Moyer-Haywood Case.—Goebel.—Julius Beiser.—“Corporations Enthroned.”—Against a Snag.—President Roosevelt as a leader of the Hawks.—Main Issue Socialism.—Fighting Tactics.—Roosevelt's Coming Prophecy.	175
XXII.	MISCELLANEOUS. Selected Miscellanies.—The Voice of Toil.—Revolutions.—Capitalism and Your Daughter.—Mr. Bryan and Immoral Money.—Gov. Altgeld's Optimism.—Miscellaneous Observations of the Author.—Equality Through Capitalistic Glasses.—The Red Flag.—Mother's Wish.—Around the Square.—The Test of a True Socialist.—How to Destroy Socialism.	186

A Plain Analysis of Socialism

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION

Fundamental Principles.

There are two classes of principles that underlie, or motives that prompt human action. These are,

1. Selfish principles or motives—those which appeal to each one's individual self interest.

2. Unselfish or moral principles—those which prompt to the consideration of the welfare of others and to the choice of certain lines of action because it is right.

First: Selfish Principle.

Principle 1. Generally, each one strives to get possession of as much as possible of the earth's resources and the products which labor extracts therefrom.

Corollary: There is nothing so heinous but that someone will be ready to do it, provided the reward is sufficient.

Second: Moral or Unselfish Principles.

Principle 2. (Justice) All men have an equal inherent right to ownership of the earth and its resources.

Corollary: All men should have an equal opportunity to use the earth's resources.

Principle 3. (Justice) Having this equal opportunity, wealth belongs to those who produce it: or, The producer of wealth is entitled to the full product of his toil.

Principle 4. (Benevolence) Human welfare is the highest basis of right.

So far, in the history of the human race, the selfish principle is the one which has generally prompted Man's action. And yet he has all along been more or less susceptible to moral influences. Since the day in which God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life (spiritual life) there has probably not been a tribe so wild and so low as not to be influenced in some small degree by moral principles. No doubt the influence was small, very small at times, and even now, with all the boasted enlightenment of society, and with all the cases that may be cited of individuals and classes of individuals who have heroically sacrificed self on the altar

of humanity, we are forced to confess that the average of morality is still not very high; that, on the average, man is still influenced more by selfish than by unselfish motives; and not only so, but this is true even of that class that is regarded as particularly moral.

Primitive Forms of Civilization.

That man is a progressive being I presume none will deny. Just how far he has progressed and how rapidly may be a question, but that the most highly civilized nations have risen from a state of barbarism or savagery in the not very far distant past is not questioned. All agree upon the one practical point, which alone concerns us in the discussion of the subject in hand, namely, that man has made progress in the past, especially in the recent past, and is making great progress now, and this admitted fact I offer as a reason why he may be expected to make further progress in the future.

With reference to the industrial life, there are four distinct stages of civilization known to man: 1. Savagery, 2. Slavery, 3. Serfdom, 4. Capitalism.

1. **Savagery.** The condition of man in the savage state is but little above that of the beast. His wants are few and simple, and may or may not be easily supplied, that depending on the nature of the country in which he lives, as to climate, productions, etc. If he depends upon fishing or hunting, like the beast of prey, his living is about as precarious. After a time he comes to desire better conditions. He makes some effort to supply himself and his family with more of the comforts of life. But his advancement is slow. There is one very effectual bar to his progress along the path that leads to civilization, and that is work, labor. There can be no civilization without it, but that is what the savage most dislikes. By and by an idea drops into his head. Instead of killing his captive, as his custom is, he will make him do his work. Thus the savage has taken the first decisive step toward civilization. He has provided a way by which the work may be done, will be done, must be done. Cruel and heartless though he be, he has unwittingly conferred a great blessing upon the human race. He has laid the foundation upon which a future civilization may be built. He has introduced human slavery into the world.

2. **Slavery.** In all the history of the human race man has betrayed a degree of selfishness which has generally been sufficient to prompt him to seek in one way or another to partially or wholly shift the burdens of life to other shoulders

and to appropriate to his own use the products of others' labors. And yet, after all, human nature is not so bad as it would at first appear, for the reason that circumstances and the institutions of society have generally been such as to wholly or partially hide from man the criminality and heinousness of his own actions, so that he is at least partially excusable on the ground that his offence is not entirely willful.

In the industrial life of all past civilizations there have been two general classes: the exploiters and the exploited. The exploiters have been generally among the most highly honored and the most enterprising. The institutions and customs of society have been such that they were perhaps, as a rule, unconscious that they were doing otherwise than pursuing their natural and inalienable rights; and, in fact, many of them are among the best of the people. But just how far man has been excusable in his "inhumanity to man" is not an essential part of this work. What we want particularly to do is to glean such facts as will aid us in shaping our course for the future.

The first method by which man appropriated the labor of his fellow man, aside from outright stealing and robbery, was the taking possession of him as a chattel and compelling him to do his work, reducing him to slavery. This was pretty tough on the poor slave, but, as before observed, there can be no civilization without work, and uncivilized man is too indolent to do the work without compulsion, and, therefore, the institution of chattel slavery in the beginning of civilization has proven a blessing to after generations. Some one has said that every nation that has risen from savagery has climbed out on the backs of slaves. There seems little doubt that among all the great nations of antiquity most of the manual labor was performed by slaves. The institution was regarded even by the philosophers of those times as an unquestionable right. The victorious nations accounted themselves humane when, instead of killing their captives, they sold them into slavery; and so we find such commercial nations as the Phoenicians hovering like vultures around the great battlefields, always ready to drive a sharp bargain in the living human spoils of victory, which they sold at a profit in other lands. The slave trade seems to have been the chief branch of commerce of those people, and a considerable portion of that of the Genoese and Venetians during the middle ages.

3. Serfdom. The institution of chattel slavery was continued in many of the warm portions of the earth, but never obtained much foothold in cool climates. Among the nations

of central and northern Europe, the care of the slave in providing him with food, clothing and shelter cut off so much of the profit that another plan was resorted to, called serfdom. The serf was simply bound to the soil, so that he could not change about from one locality to another, and yet was left with some degree of liberty, being permitted to go and come for the most part as he pleased; and being treated somewhat as a human being, instead of as a mere chattel or thing, he was better contented, and became much more trustworthy than the chattel slave, and was often called into military service. He was generally left to shift for himself in the matter of food, clothing and shelter, which added to his own development and relieved the master, who was glad to escape the burden.

The serf had little liberty except some of its forms; his condition as to the enjoyments of life did not differ much from that of the chattel slave, except in outward appearance. This difference, however, counted for much, in that it promoted the cultivation of a greater degree of self respect.

But serfdom, as well as chattel slavery, could not continue always. Both must give way before changing economic conditions and the increasing light of civilization. So they had to go, and have been replaced by another method of exploitation, the wage system, or capitalism.

4. Capitalism.—Definitions. The value of a thing is its worth and is of two kinds, intrinsic and commercial.

The intrinsic value is its real worth as indicated by its beneficial utility.

The commercial value is its worth in exchange for other things.

Wealth consists of all articles that have commercial value.

Capital is any portion of wealth which is used in the production of other wealth.

The owner of such productive wealth is called a capitalist, the term being generally applied to one who owns a considerable portion of it.

Money is a standard used in measuring value and is anything that is used as a medium of exchange.

Capital requires the application of labor in order to make it productive.

When a capitalist employs one or more persons to apply his or their labor to his capital in the production of wealth, paying to each one a stipulated sum of money for his services, such sum is called a wage; and an industrial system in which the workers have most or all the forms of freedom and work for a wage is called the wage system, or capitalism, as distinguished from slavery and serfdom.

The wage system was extensively practiced by the ancients, though how extensively, or when it first became the prevailing system, may be difficult to determine. Certain it is, however, that when slavery and serfdom disappeared they were replaced by the wage system.

And again we may observe that the advantages to the worker of the wage system over slavery or serfdom are mostly in outward appearance; for it has often happened that the lot of the wage worker has been harder than that usually accorded to the slave or serf. But again we say that this difference in outward appearance counted for a great deal. The condition of the chattel slave, that of abject servitude, always subject to the beck and call and oversight of another, was degrading in the extreme. The serf, having some of the forms of liberty, made some advancement. His self respect was raised; his intellect received a decided stimulus; he became more trustworthy; his labor more skillful, and therefore more profitable to his employers. Production was no doubt increased over what it was with chattel slavery, and would probably have been much greater, had it not been for some of the evils of the Feudal System with which serfdom was generally connected.

But under the wage system the worker, having all the outward forms of liberty, came to regard himself as in all respects a free man. As a result, he soon rose in intellectual capacity, in skill, in enterprise. As a result of the introduction of machinery production was greatly increased and the standard of living was raised somewhat. The profit which the capitalist derived from his labor was greatly increased, so that there has come about that great concentration of wealth, with the great power which it exerts in the world, that has given to the whole system the name capitalism.

As compared with the older industrial systems, the wage system or capitalism has been a great blessing to the human race; nevertheless, capitalism is but a method of exploitation by which the capitalist appropriates to himself the labor of the wage worker, and, as we shall see, it too must soon be weighed in the balance and found wanting before an enlightened public conscience and be replaced, may we not hope, by a system in which there shall be no more exploitation, and under which "man's inhumanity to man" shall forever cease?

"Man, whose heaven erected face
With smiles of love adorn;
Man's inhumanity to man
Makes countless thousands mourn."—Burns.

CHAPTER II.

COMMERCE.

Primitive Arts. The wants of man in the primitive state are few and simple. With a club he kills his game, tears it into pieces, and devours it raw. Accidentally he discovers the use of a sharp stick. In the same way, perhaps, he learns the use of fire. With a shell or sharp rock he sharpens his stick; next he hardens it in the fire and has a somewhat formidable weapon, a wooden spear.

Another very important accomplishment was the learning to throw his spear. Here his acquirements came to a standstill for awhile. With the development of the spear and the javelin the savage probably rested in the thought that he had reached the utmost of human attainment in this line. After some time, perhaps many centuries, a further great discovery is made, and that, to him, most wonderful weapon and instrument of the chase, the bow and arrow, is developed.

Division of Labor. In his primitive condition, each man is generally his own mechanic. His highest skill is exerted in carving out, with his rude instruments, the bow and arrow. Some have not skill to do this with any degree of success. Others have special aptitudes, and they from preference, while still others from necessity, as, for instance, by reason of being old or crippled, cultivate their mechanical skill by making and supplying tools to those who are less skillful, but stronger and more active, and receive from them in return a portion of the products of the chase. It was somewhat thus that man first learned the principle of the division of labor.

Exchange. Simple as were the wants of the savage, it often happened that these could not all be supplied from one locality, and so exchanges became necessary. Shells and fish from the seashore were exchanged for articles of the interior. Nuts and berries of one locality were exchanged for the game and skins of another. In such simple beginnings, commerce originated. The simplest method of exchange, and no doubt that which was used at first, was by barter, exchanging one thing for another. As an exclusive method this did not probably continue long. And yet it has been used more or less through all succeeding generations. Those of us who have passed the half century mark may easily recall the old log cabin days when money was scarce and people exchanged their products, often without much regard for money value. It was a common occurrence for a man to plow or gather corn or make rails for the cobbler who worked during the same time making or mending his shoes. In the same way

the farmer exchanged work with the carpenter, the blacksmith, the tanner, etc.

It is easy to see that the true and just basis of exchange is the labor time required in the production, due allowance being made for the value of skilled labor. To what extent this principle was carried in exchanging articles already produced is of course unknown, but it was probably never extensively used, for the reason that man, even among the nations who have attained the highest development hitherto known, has not generally been sufficiently unselfish and fair minded to live up to a true and just standard. And this opens up before us a broad side view of an important moral phase of the subject.

Here let us pause and restate two of the principles mentioned at the beginning of Chapter I, namely, All men have an equal inherent right to ownership of the earth and its resources; and, Wealth belongs to those who produce it.

For many years these principles, more or less definitely stated, have been flaunted to the breeze on the banners of Socialism, and in fact, of nearly all reformatory movements in all parts of the world. They have constituted a standing challenge to the world for refutation; but notwithstanding the fact that they are an acknowledged contradiction of, and menace to, our present system of society, they have stood unassailed, and for but one reason, namely, that they are simply unassailable. They are too self evident to even a superficial thinker to be questioned. And yet they condemn the fundamental institutions of society. Principle II. places the moral ownership of the earth in the whole people, while we find the legal ownership, even in our own new America, in the hands of a comparatively few, and fast passing into the hands of a very few. Principle III. vests the moral ownership of the whole product of labor in the laborer, while we find the legal ownership of most of it in other hands.

In exchanging the products of labor, as before observed, man has generally proven too selfish to conform to a just standard. With the individualistic method of production, even though the moral sentiment might be high enough to attempt the adoption of the labor time basis as a custom, there would be so many exceptional cases and side conditions that they together with man's selfishness would soon overturn the custom. To illustrate some of these, A has a surplus of corn and B a surplus of wheat. A desires an exchange but B objects, saying he has sufficient corn for his own use, and as there is an overproduction of corn in the community he would have to hold it for a long time before he would be likely to have an opportunity to exchange it for some other article he needed.

So he demands from A a larger amount of corn than is represented by the labor time of the wheat, and though he be strictly honest in his intentions, yet unless he be unusually fair minded and unselfish B will incline to magnify the difference in the value to him. A, looking at it from his own point of view, will incline to minimize them; nevertheless he must have wheat and doesn't know where else to get it. So he reluctantly accedes to B's terms, at the same time feeling that B has taken advantage of his necessity; and, perhaps, resolving that he will take a like advantage at the first opportunity. B also reckons on corn being more easily spoilt and more likely to be destroyed by rats and mice than wheat, and if it turns out that he makes a great gain by the transaction he justifies himself saying it was worth a great deal to take so much risk.

If A's surplus consists of cattle, horses and other livestock, their care and feed while holding them for a reduction of the supply must be taken into consideration. If it is in perishable articles, like potatoes, for instance, that also must be reckoned. Cases like these would soon multiply, until the labor time basis would soon disappear; and practically, each one would seek to get the best possible exchange for himself. And that is just what has come to pass.

In all past civilizations so far as history informs us, the agreed relative value of the articles exchanged, or the agreed money price of the articles sold or exchanged has been the basis of practically all exchanges. Generally, each one seeks the best of the bargain, but not always. In many rural communities and religious societies there has been a disposition to refrain from charging exorbitant prices. But the tendency has been to drift to the idea that the value of an article is the most that it will sell for, and that is the principle that controls in all our exchanges to-day. This constitutes a part of the system which has grown up with it,

The Competitive System. The competitive system has three essential elements: 1. The Agreed Price; 2. The Law of Supply and Demand, and 3. Competition.

The first has already been discussed.

2. The Law of Supply and Demand. When a less quantity of any article is offered for sale than would-be purchasers are seeking to buy, the supply is said to be less than the demand; when there is as much offered as is desired to be purchased, the supply is said to equal the demand, and when there is more offered the supply is said to be greater than the demand.

One who makes, causes to grow, or gathers an article is

called a producer; the making or gathering or both, the production, and the whole of the article produced, the product.

Those who use an article that is produced are called the consumers, and the act of using, the consumption of that article.

The supply of an article does not always correspond to the production, for several reasons, among which are, that the producer may be too busy at something else to move the product to market; or, he may be holding for an expected rise in the price. Similarly, the demand may be greater than the consumption. The consumer may find it more convenient at a particular time to purchase and store away for future use, than to wait till he needs it, and he may desire to purchase before there is an expected rise in the price. When this is the case, profit mongers enter the field expecting to reap a harvest for themselves by buying and holding for a rise. In the past they often competed with each other and forced the price up. In recent times, however, they are generally shrewd enough to combine explicitly or tacitly, or divide territory.

When the supply is less than the demand, the price goes up and remains so until more is produced, or the producer is induced by the higher price to put more of the product on the market. When the supply exceeds the demand the price falls and remains down till the supply is consumed, or the consumer is induced by the lower price to store more for future use. It will be observed that an under supply with its higher price stimulates production, while an over supply with its lower price stimulates consumption.

3. Competition. When a large enough number of persons engage in the production of a commodity to furnish an over supply and a consequent fall in the price, it is evident that some of them must go out of business, or a part, or all of them, must diminish their production.

When a number are desirous of selling their product in order to buy other necessities and the amount of the product offered is greatly in excess of the demand, since the purchaser always seeks to buy as cheaply as possible, it is evident that those who offer at the lowest price will be the first to sell.

This causes a competition or struggle among the producers. Generally it is some expense to fit up for the production of a given article, so that those who have been at the expense dislike to change to some other calling; and besides, it often occurs that they see no other opportunity elsewhere, so they set their minds to work, studying how they may reduce the cost of production so as to enable them to undersell their competitors. Better tools, better methods, lower

wages to hired help, harder work and longer hours—any or all of these are brought into requisition in the competitive struggle. Finally, those who fall behind in the struggle change wholly or in part to producing something else, until the supply becomes diminished so that it is less than the demand. Then the price begins to rise; for, let it be noted, whenever the supply is less than the demand the price rises, and whenever it is greater the price falls. And let us note also that this principle applies to money and labor as well as to ordinary articles of merchandise.

Such then is the competitive system of exchanging wealth; a system that is as old as history and which has been depended upon by all past civilizations to stimulate production, keep the wheels of commerce turning, and bring to each one's door such a variety of labor's products as will supply his every want. The fact has been recognized all along by thinking people, that it is far from providing justice in each individual case; and yet it was regarded as, on the whole, generally bringing approximate justice; that, like a game of chance, if one loses in one transaction, he will gain it back in another. There can be no doubt about the similarity, and more is the pity for the competitive system, that the resemblance is so strong. As in an ordinary game tricks are introduced that give the strong an advantage over the weak, so it is in competition; and whether or not man could have risen from savagery as well without as with competition, and however well it may be suited to a low stage of civilization, one thing is certain; the competitive system is based on pure selfishness, and is, therefore, not well suited to a high civilization. Allowing for exceptions, the producer produces more in order that he may have more for himself, may get more money into his own pockets, and not for the purpose of making the price cheaper to the consumer; he withholds his product from the market in hope of getting a better price later on, and not for the purpose of giving his fellow producers a better opportunity of selling theirs, and he changes to some other occupation knowing that his doing so will be against the interests of those of that occupation, because he seeks to better his own condition and not because he is desirous of alleviating the condition of those in the occupation which he is leaving. Again, in the same way, the consumer buys heavily in a crowded market, simply because he gets more for the money, and not to accommodate those who are anxious to sell.

Yes, our great commercial system, the competitive system, is exceedingly selfish. We have become so accustomed to it, however, that it hardly seems so. We have come to

take it as a matter of course and go right on and seldom think of it as being otherwise than all right. Its main arm, competition, has extended into and become a part of all industrial systems. They too were born and nurtured in selfishness, and they too were, for a long time, taken as a matter of course, regarded as a natural condition, and therefore right. After a time economic conditions changed, the public conscience was awakened, and serfdom had to go; chattel slavery had to go. Then public conscience, seeing there were no more cases on docket, or at least none of importance, was quietly rocked to sleep.

For a long time she has been slumbering. Often she has been disturbed by unpleasant dreams. Sometimes she has been startled and partially awakened, but only to think somewhat stupidly for a very short interval of her hideous visions, and then relapse into the same unconscious slumber. The disturbances have become more frequent, and recently she has been aroused by events of so startling a nature that it is certain she is actually waking up. We may also add that the events that are now transpiring are so intensely exciting that there can scarcely be a doubt that she will remain awake. Soon she will be seen donning the ermine and taking her place on the bench. Soon our great competitive, capitalistic, wage slavery civilization will be called up before her to answer to an indictment in which it is charged with all the crimes that are known to civilized man. The trial will no doubt be long and tedious. The ground will be stubbornly contested, inch by inch. Every falsehood and every device which human ingenuity can invent will be brought into requisition. The defendant will be supported by all the power that concentrated wealth can furnish, and it will be a giant to cope with. Nevertheless, truth is mighty and will finally prevail. The evidence will be sifted; it will thoroughly convict the defendant, who will be found guilty of all the crimes charged in the indictment, and will be sentenced to be trampled under foot amid the wreck and rubbish of a semi-barbarous past.

But let us observe that the public conscience is largely under the care and supervision of the ruling class, the most influential, the wealthiest class, the class that has control of the government, the press, and all the institutions of society; this class usually lulls her to sleep or awakens her, which ever best suits its purpose, based, of course, on its own self interest. So long as chattel slavery best suited its purpose the hush-a-bye song was continued so that the cry of the oppressed bondman was not heard and the shrill cry of the abolition agitator was smothered and confused so that the

sleeper was but occasionally startled. But when the time came that wage slavery was more profitable to the more powerful masters than chattel slavery, then the public conscience was called up and chattel slavery had to go. The Cuban atrocities had been long continued, little noticed by the people of the United States; but in the year 1898 our imports exceeded our exports, the capitalists must have a market for their surplus products; so the great dailies immediately began to parade before the public, pictures of human butchery, of Spanish tyranny and Cuban misery. The smaller periodicals and the local press copied these articles, the public conscience was awakened and the war followed. So it has been in most wars of conquest; and often that most sacred thing, that purest gem of society, the public conscience, has been utilized by a corrupt plutocracy to minister to their insatiable greed. Sometimes, when the public danger is very great, or the public conscience is greatly outraged, a weaker influential party may succeed in arousing her in spite of the efforts of the stronger to muffle and confuse their cry; but generally the stronger party, the wealthiest class, prevails to such an extent that the cry of the weaker is little heard. I trust I may be pardoned for anticipating somewhat, but it is a convenient point to say that the present awakening has been caused by several widely different elements, chiefly the smaller capitalists and those under their influence, and the Socialist agitators. For a number of years the latter have cried aloud and not entirely without success; for the sleeper has sometimes been known to sit up and rub her eyes, only, however, to be lulled to sleep again, but now, the smaller capitalists, who formerly were principal singers in the lullaby chorus, have become alarmed at the prospect of being swallowed up by the great capitalists, have suddenly dropped out of the chorus, have joined the agitators and are violently shaking the sleeper with magazine and newspaper articles much to the chagrin and discomfort of the great capitalists, who appear to have been taken by surprise.

And permit me to remark in passing that I do not wish to be understood as claiming that conscience is the only motive, or even the strongest that determines national action. It is, however, a factor that comes in to be reckoned with and cannot be ignored under a popular government like our own, or any other where the popular will is consulted. It is a creature of education, and is very pliant. Naturally self-assertive, it quickly loses this quality when the attention is distracted or directed into other channels. And so it is that those who have the power to gain and hold the public attention often perpetrate a wrong against society by educating the

public conscience through specious argument and skillful maneuvering, till the wrong seems right, or by distracting the attention till the wrong is overlooked.

The exercise of the public conscience occurs mainly in those cases where a wrong is proposed or actually perpetrated against a class, and the main body of society recognizes the wrong and disapproves it for that reason, and not because of their own self-interest in the matter. When a wrong is perpetrated against the great body of the people their recognition and disapproval of the wrong could hardly be regarded as a matter of conscience, but rather of self interest, which in extreme cases takes on the form of self preservation. In the case of American chattel slavery the Northern capitalists opposed it through self interest while with the masses of the people it was almost exclusively a matter of conscience. The capitalists, having control of the press, held the attention upon the evil till the public conscience was aroused, which resulted in a great tidal wave of indignation that swept all before it.

The condition of the slave was so degraded that what he thought and said and did cut very little figure in his emancipation. Nearly all of this work had to be done by those above him who sympathized with him, and whose consciences revolted at the injustice heaped upon him. In our present case it is different. True, there is a class at the bottom, the submerged tenth, if you please, whose condition is pitiable in the extreme, worse, far worse than was that of the black slave. A large part of these are nearly as ignorant and about as little able to help themselves. Their emancipation depends upon the class above them, the great body of the people, who, as they come to learn and realize their abject condition, are coming to sympathize more and more with them; and whose consciences are coming to revolt more and more at the injustice heaped upon them. We may also add that again a great tidal wave of indignation is rapidly rising that will surely sweep all before it. Thus far the cases are alike; but here the divergence begins—in the causes which produce the indignation. Much of it is caused by the outrage against the public conscience, growing out of the degradation of the submerged class, and this alone would, no doubt, in time produce the sweeping wave.

There is, indeed, a great sympathy springing up among the great body of the people in behalf of the man at the bottom, which is becoming a great force; but a far more powerful than this is that which springs from self interest and the impulse of self preservation. How long before I or my children will be in the same condition? This is the question which startles. It appeals to the man who has a dollar a day

job to-day but is doubtful as to whether it will last till next week. In the same way it appeals to the two dollar, three dollar, five or ten dollar man; to the clerk behind the counter, and the farmer in the field; to the preacher in the pulpit, and the judge upon the bench; to lawyers, doctors, teachers and men of all professions; to men of low salaries and men of high salaries—all these classes are coming to entertain a feeling of great insecurity; and with all any forecast of the future is shrouded with a more or less gloomy foreboding.

CHAPTER III.

THE TRUST

As we have seen competition has been depended upon to provide approximate justice in all commercial transactions. And yet all political economists, from Adam Smith down, agree that under competition the tendency is for wealth gradually to become concentrated into the hands of a few. During the last half century, with the advent of machinery on a large scale, this tendency has been greatly accelerated. By the use of machinery the production of wealth has been greatly increased. Often there has been a real or apparent overproduction of some articles, and in all such cases opportunity was offered to the exploiting capitalists to add greater profits to their already rapidly increasing stock of wealth. Fortunes, great fortunes, sprang into existence and came rolling and gathered as they rolled. The speed with which the concentration went on became greatly accelerated. The signs seemed ominous. Wise men began to shake their heads, saying, "It is only a question of time."

But within the last twenty years a new factor has come on the scene. A strange comet has appeared on the commercial horizon. It was a mere speck at first, and only drew a passing remark from the casual observer. But a little study revealed two very important and startling facts: First, it was coming directly this way; and, secondly, it was travelling with a rapid and very greatly accelerated velocity. I mean that somewhat varied form of capitalistic combination which we call the "Trust." The rapid advance of the stranger soon occasioned some solicitude among the people. The politicians were consulted, and they simply said, "Never mind, only elect our party and we'll soon break the trust." A few of the people became alarmed, and then the politicians began to howl, "Down the trust!" and for a dozen years it has been the campaign watchword of both the great political parties.

But nothing stayed nor even hindered the onward sweep of the great comet. Now she is upon us. Already she has demolished all that was claimed to be good in our competitive system. The capitalists have substituted combination for competition. All that is left of competition is among the farmers, the smaller tradesmen and the wage workers (for labor, too, is a commodity subject to competition); and to all of these classes it is the direst curse. It is becoming apparent that our liberties must be entirely swept aside unless some decisive step be soon taken. And these are the startling and exciting incidents that are just now awakening the sleeper mentioned in the last chapter. How much of liberty is left even now is a very serious question. The process of wealth concentration under competition was gradual, yet moved with an accelerated velocity. Under the trust the acceleration is so stupendously increased that there is hardly a comparison. The one may be called an absorption, while the other is simply a swallowing process. And if the process continues at the present rate it will not require long for the trust to swallow our whole civilization.

And now, what is this great monster? What is the nature of this thing we call the "Trust?" Just wherein lies its power to take the wealth from the many and place it in the hands of the few? Just what is it doing, can it do, will it do, and what is, and will be the effect on society, and what may society do with it? Under the competitive system each individual producer, consumer, middleman, distributor or speculator (and let it be remembered that a partnership or corporation is accounted an individual), each individual constitutes a unit. When every unit acts independently of every other unit competition is said to be normal; but when two or more units combine so as to raise or lower prices for the purpose of enhancing their mutual interests, competition is thereby rendered abnormal to the extent that such combination affects prices.

As we have already seen competition failed to secure justice in each individual exchange. It was recognized as a game of chance; but it was thought to be a game in which each one had a fair chance, so that in a large number of exchanges there would, on the average, generally be approximate justice secured to each one. It follows then, that when two or more persons who own any commodity, as beef, for instance, conspire together to raise the price, or when purchasers conspire to lower it, they play unfairly, or are guilty of foul play, or, to put it in up-to-date language, they have formed a trust. It does not matter whether the conspiracy is a written agreement, an oral agreement, or an unexpressed,

tacit understanding. If it affects prices it is an unfair play. It is virtually a trust.

Such foul play is probably as old as commerce and has, no doubt, been practiced more or less through all past stages of civilization; but the cases were probably comparatively limited in number and generally on a small scale. It is only in very recent times that it has reached such grand proportions.

While the industrial units were small such combinations were of little consequence. Perhaps the first cases that attracted general attention were where two railroads belonging to two opposing companies ran parallel. At first they cut rates to the great delight of the people, who rejoiced greatly in the realization of the saying that "competition is the life of trade." Soon the companies saw their folly and came to realize that while competition is the life of trade, it is also the death of the trader. They therefore united and raised charges as high as the traffic would bear, and the people's rejoicing came to a sudden stop.

But this was only the beginning of sorrows. Soon the real thing appeared. A very little thing at first, it soon grew to make itself seen and felt and feared, and now we are up against it. Now we have trusts galore—great railroad trusts, great iron and steel trusts, a great oil trust that has already swallowed several others, great steamship trusts, machinery trusts, woollen trusts, cotton trusts, linen trusts, clothing trusts and all sorts and sizes of manufacturing trusts. Then there are coal trusts, wood trusts, lumber trusts, shingle trusts, coffin trusts, meat trusts, flour trusts, fish trusts, fruit trusts, leather trusts, professional trusts of all sorts, labor trusts of all sorts, mining trusts and so on without limit, not forgetting the money trust. Go through a department store and pick out all the articles the price of which is in no way affected by the trust; you may have a small vest pocket series, but more likely you will have nothing.

The methods of the trust are varied, and yet may, perhaps, all be expressed by the word combination, as opposed to competition. There are combinations to bull or bear the market, raising or lowering prices according as those in the combine desire to sell or buy. One of the chief methods of raising prices is by limiting the supply, which is done in several ways: one, by curtailing the output of each plant in the combine; another, by pooling profits and closing part of the plants; still another, by destroying a part of the product. The last is resorted to perhaps oftener in cases of perishable articles like fish, potatoes and other vegetables, fruit, etc., large quantities of which are often dumped into rivers and

harbors. But it does not by any means stop with what are usually termed perishable articles. Even shiploads of spices are sometimes dumped into the sea. After the speculators have bought up practically all of a cotton crop they sometimes burn large quantities of it. In all these cases the object is to reduce the product till the supply is less than the demand, knowing that then the price will rise, so that they can get more for the remainder than they could have gotten for the whole product at the lower prices which the over supply would have brought.

Often intimidation is resorted to, as in cases where great packing associations coerce local markets all over the country into buying their products by threatening to undermine them with rival shops. The immense profits which the great capitalists are enabled by these methods to pile up annually constitutes in each case a large fund for investment. And a place for investment is not far to seek; for those who are engaged in small manufacturing or business of any kind, having to pay a royalty on every article used in their business, and finding their profits continually reduced, are therefore ready to sell at a reduced price to the trust combine, which by application of large scale methods, adds greatly to its holdings and its profits and increases its power to swallow. Again by the uniting of a number of big plants, the swallowing power is vastly multiplied.

And where is this swallowing to end? To me there can be but one answer, and that is that unless something can be done to avert it, the time is not very far distant when some mammoth combine will gulp down the last morsel and howl because there are no more worlds to swallow. And it begins to look very much as though the great "Standard Oil" combine will surely be "it". When we consider the vantage ground occupied by this great octopus, and the power it wields over all wealth, we find that the final swallowing process has really proceeded much further than at first appears; in fact, that practically all that is left unswallowed is virtually in the dragon's mouth, since it is under his control. To show what I mean I will close this chapter with an extract from "The Shameful Misuse of Wealth," by Cleveland Moffett, found on page 7 of "Success Magazine" for January, 1906:

"Sixteen years ago Thomas G. Shearman, a distinguished corporation lawyer and a brilliant writer on economic questions, prophesied that 'within thirty years the United States will be substantially owned by less than one in five hundred of the male population!' Nor is evidence wanting that his words are coming true. The land of this country is still widely owned, although hundreds of millions of acres of its grazing lands, timber lands and mineral lands have been shamelessly stolen in land grants and land grabs; but the farmers and small producers are

absolutely at the mercy of the railroads, which, with their two hundred thousand miles of tracks, their capitalization of over twelve billion (par value) and their army of five million people dependent on them for a livelihood, are practically controlled by nine men—John D. Rockefeller, J. P. Morgan, E. H. Harriman, George Gould, W. K. Vanderbilt, J. J. Hill, A. J. Cassatt, W. H. Moore and William Rockefeller. And John Moody, author and publisher of 'Moody's Manual,' in his exhaustive and authoritative work, 'The Truth About Trusts,' finds that in the United States to-day there are 440 large industrial, franchise and transportation trusts with a capitalization of over twenty thousand million dollars. Which, says the 'Wall Street Journal,' is 'one-fifth of the wealth of the country and the most powerful part of it, for it is wealth under such concentrated control that it practically sways the whole.' And Mr. Moody concludes that a score of men practically control this twenty billions, which is the aggregate of our manufacturing and transportation resources. They control the avenues of distribution and the agencies for transforming raw materials into finished products; so it is plain that these twenty men—Rockefeller, Morgan, Gould, Harriman and the rest—indirectly control nearly all the remaining wealth in the country, since whatever comes out of the ground or is fed by it must pass over their lines of transit and through their factories (and at their terms) before it can get from the producer to the consumer. These are signs of the times!"

CHAPTER IV.

REVIEW OF PRESENT CONDITIONS.

When we compare present with past conditions, we find much to commend. We find that on the whole man has made great advancement. The average of wealth per capita is much greater than at any former period. In our own country and in all parts of the earth except where there is an overcrowded population there has come to be little fear of famine. The average standard of living in all those things that go to make life enjoyable is higher than ever before. The average family has better food, better clothing and better shelter, better schools and more books and periodicals of all sorts, more pictures and more and better musical instruments; and in the matter of travel and communication we have made still greater progress. Where a century ago it required a month or two to learn of the severe illness or death of a relative or friend, now we may be informed at once, and, stepping aboard the next train, may be whirled away hundreds, even thousands of miles to the bedsides of those who are near and dear to us.

With better education has come a greater degree of refinement, higher ideals, and a much fuller appreciation of that which is beautiful and good. While we still hear of wars and rumors of wars, and the wars are of the most destructive character, yet, on the whole, there is far less of rudeness, coarse-

ness and fierceness in the average of human nature as we see it to-day.

In the department of medical science, surgery and in the various means of restoring and preserving health, we have made great progress. The light of modern investigation has wholly or in part banished the terrors of a number of contagious diseases that have so often been the scourge of society in centuries past. Indeed, so much has been done that the average length of human life, which has been on the gradual decline through all past history, is now said to be decidedly rising.

There is, perhaps, no other field of progress that can show a greater degree of advancement than that which provides not only for the increase of wealth, but also for alleviating the intensity of the toil and the hardship of the workers. It requires but one word to explain what I mean, and that word is "machinery." The very mention of this word sets the mind to drawing contrasts; contrasting the wooden mould board with our gang plow; hand sowing, with our double disk drill; the sickle, scythe and cradle, with our mower, self binder, header and combined harvester; threshing with flail or tramping with animals, with our modern traction steam rig; removing cotton seed by hand, with the cotton gin; the spinning wheel and hand loom, with the factory; the stage coach and ox team, with our overland flyer and double or triple header freight train; the pony express, with the telegraph and telephone, etc., etc. In all departments of human industry machines without limit have been introduced which are calculated to confer untold blessings on humanity, in that by their use without inexhaustible labor, there may be produced a plentiful supply of all necessities, and not only necessities, but an abundance of the luxuries of life.

In a land like our own with so great an abundance and variety of the earth's natural resources, it is possible with our modern labor saving appliances to produce an abundance of all necessities and all those luxuries that will help to make life fuller and happier. And so great is the labor saved by machinery, that this may be done without overtaxing the energies of any of the laborers. In fact, most of the work is done by machines. A man guides the machine, and the machine does the work which formerly required the labor of five, ten, twenty, fifty or one hundred men, and the remainder are left to run other machines, and when all the machines have been manned there is so large a force left that the work which must be done without machines may be so divided among them as not to be burdensome on any. And it need no longer be that children

must be absent from school with the old time excuse of "staid-at-home-diggin'-taters."

In the olden time the farmer (and most of the people then were farmers), with his rude tools prepared the soil, planted, cultivated, harvested, threshed and garnered his grain. He also made many articles that now come from the factory, such as shoes for his whole family. He raised a few sheep, sheared them, washed the wool, the housewife picked it, and after it was carded, plied her wheel, pacing back and forth from side to side of the room, often the only room in the house, till the rolls were worked into yarn. Then she colored the yarn. Then, with her home made loom she wove it into cloth. Then she entered upon her final task of cutting, fitting and sewing all the clothes for the whole family, often of ten or a dozen. Of course, the knitting of mittens and stockings of all sizes went along with the rest. And besides all this there was the regular round of cooking, washing, caring for the children in sickness or health, soap making, which was started with the ash hopper, milking cows (for she was lucky if her husband found time to milk even part of the cows), making butter, attending to chickens, turkeys and geese, including the picking of the last named, and many other things too numerous to mention. Of course, there was no time to be lost, and all through the autumn and early winter, often all winter, she worked far into the night weaving, making new garments and mending the old that they might hold out till the new ones were completed.

At the other side of the big fireplace making or mending shoes or harness or making an axe or a hoe handle, or at some other odd job sat her husband. Or, perhaps, he spent most of the evening caring for the stock, for every day was needed to gather corn, cut and haul fodder, cut and haul wood, make and haul rails, build fences, make sheds, etc.

There was generally no time nor money for expensive barns or fine houses, and generally the clothes were but plain home spun plainly made, no flaps, no flounces, no frills. Yet, as a rule, the people were comparatively happy, simply because they knew no better, were happy in the sense that they were not unhappy. But where is the farmer now that would like to go back to the old log cabin days and methods? And where, oh, where is the miss just fresh from college or high school, or even the common school, who would be willing to tackle such a proposition?

No, we do not desire to return to that mode of living. We have learned a better way. We are ready to shower blessings upon the host of inventors who have brought to light the means by which it is possible for the whole people to enjoy

to the full the material bounties and sweetness of life, and not only so, but, having leisure for intellectual culture, may come into that higher and fuller enjoyment which results from the mind being expanded and awakened to the contemplation of all that is high, and noble, and grand, and beautiful, and pure, and good, in history, in art, in religion, in science, in philosophy and in the world of nature generally.

Yes, when we contemplate these things we are led to exclaim, "What wonderful progress! How fortunate the people of this generation!" But wait. There is another side to the picture. There are two sides to this sheet, a bright side and a dark side. We have reached the bottom of the bright page, and will continue this topic where it belongs, on

The Dark Page. With a population of over 80,000,000, and an estimated aggregate of wealth of about \$100,000,000,000, our average of wealth per capita is about \$1,200, or \$6,000 for the average family of five. The working man would figure that, with that amount, by working very moderately he would have a very comfortable living for his family. But unfortunately for the worker, the wealth is not so evenly distributed. Instead of \$6,000 per family the average wealth of nine-tenths of the families of the United States is not far from one-tenth of this sum, or \$600, while half of the people have practically nothing; while one per cent of the people have ninety-nine per cent of the wealth, five thousand have nearly one-sixth; ten men have one-fiftieth and one family has one one-hundredth part of our national wealth. So it seems that our labor saving proposition does not work so well as it might; that instead of machinery being a blessing to all it is but the direst curse to a large part of the people of our fair land. Though the average standard of living has risen, yet the rise is very small compared with what it ought to be, and, leaving out of the account the luxurious living of the very wealthy, were it not for the fact that a large part of the toilers of all past generations have had a great deal of hardship to endure, it might be doubtful whether the average lot of the masses had improved at all. Certain it is that whatever may be said of labor saving machinery as a blessing to humanity, yet, compared with what it should be, it is certainly a signal failure. If you have any doubt upon this point, go and read, if you have not already, such writings as Hunter's "Poverty," "The Shameful Misuse of Wealth," by Cleveland Moffett, and the published accounts of those who have investigated the use of child labor in the factories of the south. Books and magazines describing these things are easily found. Read them. You will probably be filled with indignation by the stories of the ruthless tyranny and unconscionable cruelty of capitalistic

greed. You will probably become heart-sick at the tales of hardship, squalid misery, wretchedness and woe.

When you stop and think, unless you have studied along this line before, you probably will be ready to say: "Yes, I can see that one reason for so much poverty is that the rich waste it upon themselves, but why should there be land lying idle, machines lying idle, and millions of people willing and able to work, idle and living like rats?" You probably understand that man will do anything for money, but fail to see where the money comes in. While I regard the facts and not the reason for their existence as the matter of chief importance in this case, yet, since the reason is so simple, we will give it a short space and then pass on.

As we have already seen, labor is a commodity subject to competition and the law of supply and demand, the same as any other commodity. The more plentiful the supply, the lower the price; and since all articles of wealth are produced for profit and not for use, it follows that the more plentiful the supply of labor the greater the profit. Of two competing establishments, the one that hires its work done the cheaper comes out ahead. Of course, in such a contest the out-of-work can expect nothing when the rivals combine and find it to their interest to stop part of their machinery, one or more mills for instance, in order to avoid an over production, that is, the production of a quantity greater than that which would bring them the greatest profit. It might seem at first glance, that it could be easily arranged for the surplus workers to take charge of the idle machinery and produce what they themselves could consume. No doubt it could be done; but as a matter of fact, it is not. You see, it is not business. In the first place, the surplus workers, of course, have no money. They must be paid in the product. The company has no use for part of the product; for their other machines make all the goods that they can sell; and to give them all the product would tend to make their other workers dissatisfied. Then, though the capitalists might see that the workers repaired the machines or made new ones, yet it would require some care and attention on their part, and they would not be likely to take so much pains. Lastly they would not, because it would diminish the supply of labor and tend to raise the price, the very thing they desire to avoid. No, no. Things are not done that way. That would not be business you know. Business is business and must be done according to business principles.

Panics. As we have observed, articles of wealth are produced for profit. The man would be called foolish who would undertake a business with no hope of making a profit out of it. In the production of wealth of all kinds in a nation a

certain amount is paid out in wages. The wage workers buy to the extent of their wages, and the money all goes back to the producers, so-called, the capitalists. The farmers and other small producers of the raw material buy to the extent of the net proceeds resulting from the sales of such raw material, that is, what they have left after settling all bills for wages, such net proceeds being usually no more than ordinary wages and often very low wages. What the capitalists have left of the manufactured product is called profit. Unless they can exchange it for wealth in the form of capital, this surplus is of no value to them, and becomes a dead weight in their hands. There are several ways by which this may be done:

1. A limited amount may be sold to the small producers beyond what their net income will purchase, they procuring the money to pay for it by loan secured by mortgage on farm or other property, and this is practically an investment of the larger or exploiting capitalists in the property of the very small capitalists, notably the farmers. I say a limited amount. The farmers are usually more or less cautious about purchasing when every additional purchase means an enlargement of the mortgage, and generally wish afterward that they had been much more cautious.

2. Whatever surplus of labor there is in the country may be employed in improving the plants or providing the luxuries of the capitalists, the wages paid the workers going to reduce the surplus product by that much.

3. If a foreign market can be found, part or all of the surplus may be shipped to a foreign country and exchanged for articles to be used in improvements and luxuries at home, or for investment in foreign capital, or for money which may be invested either at home or abroad.

4. Lastly, this surplus product may be given away, either for or without a consideration. It may be given to the most influential of the people in order to secure their support, or it may be given to the whole people with or without the same object in view.

If, from any cause (and the causes are multitudinous), the surplus piles up and no market can be found, then there is only one thing to do. The mills must close. The workers must sit around and eat charity soup till the surplus product is used up or wasted or an outlet is found for it. This is what is called a panic. The financial loss always falls heaviest upon the debtor class generally, and especially upon the farmers, stockmen and other small producers, who supply the raw material, and in this form and in their hands most of the surplus remains. The great capitalist stops short when his

market fails. He sells to the working man till he gets all his money. He sells to the small producers till he gets all their money; but these are, many of them, in debt. They have made extensive improvements and bought machinery. They must have money. They apply to the bank. The banker shakes his head. It is not to be had. "Oh, yes, the security is gilt-edge, but the fact is, there is no money in circulation." The banker is not afraid of the loan. The great capitalist is not afraid of it; but money always flows to the point that promises the greatest profit, and for this reason it is now reserved for the purpose of taking in the snaps, and when they have all been gathered in, then it is reported that times are improving very decidedly, for the banks are beginning to loan money. So, all those whose fortunes have not been swallowed seek relief from their crippled condition, and, as business presently starts up, they are found moving forward with a greater debt than before. Such is a panic. It is often the case that the workers would be able to consume all the surplus product if only they had the wherewith to buy.

In a country so rich in natural resources as is ours, where people are enterprising and industrious, and where there is so much labor saving machinery, panics are the inevitable result whenever foreign markets fail. The foreign market does not fill the bill, unless the people buy and consume more of our products than we buy and consume of theirs. When they do their money flows out of their country into ours, and the only way they can get it back is to borrow it of our capitalists by mortgaging their lands or other forms of wealth, or selling some of it outright to them. It is evident that people cannot go on long in this way without becoming bankrupt. All enlightened nations have become too wise to pursue such a course. Even benighted China is awakening to a sense of her danger. Just now the nations are ransacking the remotest corners of the earth in search of markets. In the intensity of the struggle they are jostling each other, grumbling, growling, threatening, and occasionally fighting weak nations. It is too expensive fighting strong ones; and then, war has become so terrible that the people recoil from it. Nevertheless, military and naval preparations of the great nations move steadily on, and unless the people come to realize more fully that every war is "a rich man's war and a poor man's fight," and do like the working people of some of the European nations have already begun to do, refuse to fight each other, there will be occasional instances of nations undertaking to crush others that are weaker, or supposed to be. Now and then the aggressor will miscalculate and draw an elephant as Russia did when she tried to crush Japan. With all the nations

struggling for markets, and not markets enough to go round, it is not strange that the struggle occasionally takes on the form of an appeal to arms.

When the markets fail our capitalists could avert a panic if they would by keeping the mills running and increase the wages of the workers and the price of raw material, which is virtually wages, or reducing the price of the finished product till the wages and the price paid for the raw material would buy all the finished product, excepting what the capitalists themselves consume. But again, "that would not be business, you know." The capitalists are not likely to be so foolish so long as there are any small producers, any little fish left, unless they come to fear the people. It is thought by some that under the pressure of this fear J. Pierpont Morgan prevented a panic in 1903. It is likely that as the people become awakened on this subject, the capitalists will proceed more cautiously and leisurely in their operations; that they will not grab quite so voraciously for "snaps," but the swallowing will go right on, if somewhat more slowly, none the less surely.

I know that the foregoing theory of panics, called the glut theory, is rejected by some writers as unscientific. Possibly it is; and I may be like the countryman who asked a physician why hanging kills people, and after being given a long, scientific definition, said, "No, no! That isn't it at all. It is just because the rope is so short that the feet cannot reach the ground." Now, whatever scientific reasons may exist, it seems to me that as hanging cannot kill so long as the feet reach the ground, so, neither will the factories close so long as the manufacturers can find a market for their goods. I admit, however, the possibility of a little discrepancy in this parallel in cases where factories are compelled to close on account of a money stringency produced by other causes.

But whatever original causes may have operated to produce the glut, it seems to me that the present intense struggle among the nations for markets goes to prove that it is the immediate cause of panics, and that it may be remedied by procuring a sufficient outlet.

CHAPTER V.

REVIEW OF PRESENT CONDITIONS (Continued).

To illustrate the baleful effects of concentrated wealth and its consequent poverty, we quote again from Cleveland Moffett's "Shameful Misuse of Wealth":

"It is interesting to consider how much richer the rich will get, and I may remark here that there is no need to inquire how much

poorer the poor will get. If they are to live at all they cannot get much poorer. What greater burden of poverty can we put on the four million American families who to-day with their best toil can gather less than four hundred dollars a year? What more can we take from them than we have already taken? The Massachusetts Bureau of Labor has collected statistics showing how these poor families spend their pitiful incomes. It appears that \$3.88 each week goes for food. Shall we cut that down? Or shall we cut down the \$2.91 a month they spend for clothing? or the \$7.50 a year they spend for furniture and household furnishings? Or the \$7.00 a month they pay for foul, dark rooms in a tainted tenement? Think what it means to support a family in a city on four hundred dollars a year, to bring up children, to provide for sickness, to furnish pleasures on four hundred dollars a year!

"And these are not the poorest of the poor, these are self respecting laborers, producers of the national wealth; there are millions of others whose lot is worse than theirs—ten million, Robert Hunter estimates, in helpless poverty, out of work, out of health, out of heart with the world, broken driftwood, vagrants, tramps—what shall we take from them?

"So the question simply is how much richer will the rich get? Will any limit be set to these vast fortunes? Are billionaires to become as abundant in the twentieth century as millionaires were in the nineteenth? Why not? We have scarcely scraped the outside crust of our national resources. What our land and industries produce to-day is nothing to what they will produce, and our present population is but a small part of what it will be. By 1960, we are assured, the national wealth that seems so enormous now (say a hundred billions in 1905) will have increased to nearly a thousand billions, and by 1990 to over two thousand billions. Such are the conclusions of experts in financial statistics, who also say that under the present competitive system nearly two-thirds of this vast increase in our national wealth will be permanently absorbed by a few thousand very rich families. Which means that whatever may befall individual millionaires or individual sons or grandsons of millionaires, the rich as a class will continue to grow richer, much richer, so that in thirty or forty years, under existing conditions, the five thousand richest Americans, instead of having fifteen billions between them, as to-day, may have fifty or a hundred billions. And still the mass of the people will have practically nothing, still hundreds of thousands with bitter toil will barely secure the necessities of life and millions will be crushed and broken in the struggle.

"So, if present conditions continue one looks ahead vainly for some brightening in the picture of our poverty and wealth, our misery and affluence, our luxury and want. Things will be worse, not better, and every year will show a more painful contrast between the few who have everything and the many who lack everything. Ponder these words from that hard financial compendium of Waldron's already quoted (p. 102): 'Little wonder then that the rich are rapidly growing richer, when but one-twentieth of the families, they are receiving one-third of the nation's annual income and are able to absorb nearly two-thirds of the annual increase made in the wealth of the nation.' Think what that means to the poor!

"What it means to the rich is that they will find it more and more difficult to spend their enormous incomes and will set a faster and madder pace of luxury and extravagance. All the signs point that way, and after all what else can they do with their money. They cannot eat it nor hang it around their necks (except some odd millions in trinkets), nor buy seats in heaven with it. There is nothing to do but flaunt it before the nation in palaces and gorgeous fetes, in costly laces and plates of gold, in furious follies that seem to cry out: 'See, we are rich, rich, rich, and you are poor.' Nor can any man say what will be the echo of that cry!"

When we compare present conditions with the fundamental principles of equal ownership already stated, together with its derived principle, "Wealth belongs to those who produce it," we find that they do not in any manner correspond; for we find the earth's resources in the hands of a few, while the laborers, who are the actual producers of wealth, have very little of it.

As heretofore observed it is a fact well understood that the agreed price is far from being a fair basis of exchange, for the reason that one of the parties may, and often does, take advantage of the other's necessities. Political economists have all along recognized the fact that the competitive system does not furnish exact justice in all individual cases, but it has been depended upon to supply approximate justice in its general application. Time has shown the mistake, and the degree of approximation has continued to deviate more and more from the line of strict justice, and now that the trusts have swept away the supposed approximation there is nothing left but what? Ruthless robbery shall I call it? Well, yes. That is surely what it is. But come, let us not be too hard on the poor millionaire. Possibly he may deserve about as much pity as blame. If the force of accidental circumstances has caused him to grow up before society a dangerous maniac, sowing destruction broadcast, wrecking the lives of multiplied millions of human beings, sending forth into millions of homes the scourge of abject want and misery, and inflicting upon all the people of our fair land a degree of injustice and hardship and anxiety that greatly mars their happiness, then society is principally to blame if it does not use its utmost endeavor to restrain him and remedy the evil. And what are most, if not all, our great capitalists but maniacs, monomaniacs, who have studied so long and with such intensity the one subject, profits, that they have become money mad and entirely reckless of the welfare of their fellowmen?

But what is the real action that has produced such baleful results? Perhaps one of the first rights recognized by human beings was the right of each one to the product of his own labor, and growing immediately out of this was the recognized right to exchange this product by mutual agreement, and this developed into the agreed price as the basis of right in all commercial exchanges, which has been recognized and adhered to by nearly all past civilizations. As we have seen this is a very defective standard. At the first it was attended by two principal evils. First, it permitted one person to take advantage of another's necessities, and, secondly, it permitted the strong minded to take advantage of the weak minded. Under competition both these evils increased greatly.

Under trust domination they are so greatly aggravated that there is practically no limit until the utmost of human endurance is reached. These two evils have been regarded all along as necessary evils. In all the centuries of man's rise from savagery society has recognized as a right belonging to each person, that he might buy for as little as he could induce or persuade the other fellow to take or sell for as much as he would for any reason consent to give, without regard to any hardship it might inflict upon the other, provided there is no direct physical compulsion. So it is a fact that cannot be controverted that a very large part of the evils that now afflict us are the result of the legitimate exercise of this principle we call a right, while the remaining part results mostly from abuses that are the natural outgrowth of it.

A young man fresh from college, his face beaming with intelligence, his open countenance the very impersonation of honesty and integrity, his mother's kiss upon his forehead, and her loving "God bless you, my boy," ringing in his ears, is whirled away to the great city where he embarks in business. Like nearly every other young man, he starts out to make a big fortune. And it must be all honest money. He does not hesitate on that point. He is careful to meet every obligation promptly and expects the same from others. He is in for profits. Therefore he says, "I buy as cheaply as I can. If the other fellow does not want to accept my offer let him sell to someone else. I sell for the most I can get. If the purchaser can do better let him do it. I do not hinder him. I employ the laborer at the lowest possible wage, and get the most work I can from him. If he is not satisfied he may quit at any time. And, besides, this is the rule of my competitors and I must follow it or go out of business. I know there is hardship and suffering on every hand, and it makes my heart bleed to see it, but what can I do to prevent it but become a pauper myself?"

He comes, however, to have a vague, indefinite feeling of guiltiness, and that there is an injustice being perpetrated somewhere, though his reason fails to show who is the guilty party. In fact, on reviewing his action he finds that he has adhered strictly to the line of his recognized rights. So he goes on, his conscience being weakened somewhat, especially if he has been successful in business, for success means profits, and profits mean an increased appetite for more profits, and this appetite for profits helps to smother the conscience. This intense craving impels him forward and causes him to forget, at least partially, the misery about him, and, to say the least of it, the process is a decidedly hardening one. Presently he comes up against another phase of commercial life. Heretofore, when he has found the other fellow in a pinch for

money, and "must have it," and no one else to buy his wares, he has exercised his acknowledged right to run the price to the lowest limit; he has followed the same principle in selling and in the employment of labor, and he has often made use of his own superior knowledge and intellectual training in his dealings with those less favored in this respect. This was his acknowledged right, was perfectly legitimate. But he has never purposely done anything to create or increase the other's necessities. Neither has he ever resorted to falsehood in order to deceive him into doing what he could not otherwise be induced to do. True, he has always kept his own counsel, which was also his admitted right. Now he has come to a point where, by a skillful movement on the commercial checkerboard, he may heap a necessity upon the other which will compel him to buy or sell to his own advantage. Perhaps the other fellow is his business rival. Maybe he has played this same game on him. In any case, his competitors follow the rule and he must follow it too or fall behind in the race. His conscience has become less assertive. His appetite for profits and the business pressure have become stronger; he has become accustomed to the suffering about him; he takes another step. And so he goes on step by step, his conscience gradually yielding, here a little and there a little. The soul dwindles away to a mere speck. Selfishness finally acquires full sway and manifests itself in crying out, "More profits! More profits!" Thus the pure and noble youth has fallen a victim to our nefarious system, has become transformed into a veritable demon, a money mad maniac, the enemy and scourge of society.

I know it is said that our great captains of industry have performed a most important and beneficent function, and that the evils that afflict society are necessary evils and could not have been avoided. Well, be it so. I have no desire to discuss this phase of the subject so far as the past is concerned. There can no good come of "crying over spilt milk," nor in spending time trying to place the responsibility for the spilling. But, drawing the mantle of charity over the past, looking backward just long enough to get our bearings, and standing in the present, the threshold between the past and the future, let us plan for the future. Taking society as we find it, regarding present conditions as the natural outgrowth of the system, which, under all the circumstances, may have been a fortunate incident, an important factor in man's social progress, and ascribing neither praise nor blame to the holders of wealth, let us examine the facts as we find them. Let us then see if we can devise some remedy for the evils that afflict us, the application of which will, to some extent, substitute justice

for injustice, plenty for poverty, equal opportunity for special privileges, virtue for vice and happiness for misery.

As before stated, the earth with all its resources naturally belongs to the whole people and not to a select few. Man requires air, water and the products of the earth. Deprive him of any of these and he dies. If a great corporation were to gain possession of the air and lay tribute upon all who breathe, it would be no worse, no more unjust than the very wealthy getting possession of the earth, as they have most of it, and laying tribute upon the people who draw their sustenance therefrom. Since wealth belongs to those who produce it, and since the very wealthy produce very little of it themselves, it follows, therefore, that the ownership by a select few of most of the earth with its natural resources, as well as most of the products of man's labor is simply an usurpation.

If our reason had failed to reveal the points of injustice in our system, the result would demonstrate very clearly the fact that there has been a great deal of injustice somewhere. It becomes clear that the great bulk of wealth is held by persons who have not earned it. They therefore hold by sufferance of the law, and society has a perfect moral right to appropriate it for the general welfare. In fact, the proposition that "Human welfare is the highest basis of right," is recognized by leading political economists, and has become too well settled to be controverted. We hear much of "vested rights," as though it were the worst of sacrilege to speak of them except with the most profound respect. But such rights are only legal rights, rights conferred by the law, and when the people decide that the law needs changing, the "vested rights" may soon become invested wrongs.

Sometimes we hear people say, "Oh, they are too lazy to work. If they would go to work like other people they might have something." Here let it be remembered that I am not defending the tramp, who by reason of his shiftlessness or discouragement caused by his degraded condition, avoids work; but it is well known that the holders of great fortunes perform practically no productive labor. There are, then, two idle classes, the idle rich and the idle poor. And since all wealth is the product of labor's hand, a very little reflection develops the fact that there is a class between that produces all that they themselves consume, and also all that is consumed by the two idle classes. Since, then, the wealth belongs to those who produce it, this last class has been robbed on both sides. What the tramp manages to get without work is so small that it is hardly worth considering. On the other hand the robbery assumes the most astounding proportions, consisting, not alone of what the idle rich consume in necessities and wanton

luxuries, but by far the greater portion going to make up their enormous profits. Again, let me assure the reader that I use the term "robbery" because that is what it amounts to, without intending any reflection upon anyone. My quarrel is against the system, not the men who are its victims. I realize that many of the men whom the system makes actual robbers are men of good intentions, and not infrequently of fairly high ideals.

Having, as I hope, discussed the underlying principles of man's social development, and the conditions that now surround us sufficiently to give the reader a fair comprehension of our present industrial system, let us pause and inquire, what of the future?

First let us inquire, what will be the probable outcome if society continues to drift on in its present channel? After studying trust development, as set forth in Chapter III., it is apparent that if we continue in the present channel some great oligarchy of wealth having overthrown, trampled under foot and destroyed commercially all the other great combinations, will sit enthroned, enjoying the fat of the land, and, guided by its interests and its whims, will distribute husks and crusts and skimmed milk to the people, as seemeth it best.

To show that the "Standard Oil" group are making strong calculations on being the conquerors, I insert here an extract from "Frenzied Finance," by Thomas W. Lawson:

"The success of 'Standard Oil' is largely due to two things—the loyalty of its members to each other and to 'Standard Oil,' and the punishment of its enemies. Each member before initiation knows its religion to be, reward for friends and extermination for enemies. Once a man is within the magic circle he at once realizes he is getting all that anyone else on earth can afford to pay him for like service, and still more thrown in for full measure. The public has never heard of a 'Standard Oil' man leaving the ranks. I know of but one case, a very peculiar one, which I shall tell of in my story. While a 'Standard Oil' man's reward is always ample and satisfactory, he is constantly reminded in a thousand and one ways that punishment for disloyalty is sure and terrible, and that in no corner of the earth can he escape it, nor can any power on earth protect him from it.

"'Standard Oil' is never loud in its rewards nor its punishments. It does not care for the public's praise nor for its condemnation, but endeavors to avoid both by keeping its 'business' to itself.

"In connection with the gas settlements I made with 'Standard Oil' it voluntarily paid one of its agents for a few days' work \$250,000. He had expected at the outside \$25,000. When I published the fact, as I had a right to, 'Standard Oil' was mad as hornets—as upset, indeed, as though it had been detected in cheating the man out of two-thirds of his just due, instead of having paid him ten times what was coming to him.

It is clear that the Rockefeller oligarchy is getting itself pretty thoroughly entrenched. In the light of these revelations there can be no doubt about its intentions, and its methods are certainly such as are well calculated to insure success. This

mighty octopus, powerful in all its parts, in its strongly intrenched position, with all its bulwarks and outer defences reinforced and strengthened by every device which wealth and ingenuity can furnish, seems well nigh invulnerable. It is not by any means entirely certain, however, that it is so. Two great enemies are just now looming up and are all astir, all excitement, the scent of battle is in the air. Already both of these are beginning to marshal their hosts for a great struggle. The first of these consists of the smaller capitalists, those outside the "magic circle." They are becoming alarmed by the threatening attitude of the great monster. They are becoming terror stricken with the dread of being swallowed. The second of these enemies is the great plain people.

The smaller capitalists (or, perhaps I should say the smaller of the great capitalists), comprise a rather uncertain group, beginning with those just outside the "magic circle" and extending downward somewhat indefinitely, (but not including the very small capitalists or middle class). This class is many times more numerous than the one above it, and, as yet, by running pretty well down the dollar scale, represents more wealth than the group above it. But since those of this class are larger in number, and therefore more difficult to organize, and since also the group above them has, for the most part, the control of the manufacturing and transportation business, they are left at a decided disadvantage, if the fight be conducted on strictly commercial lines. Their main hope is in entering the political field and playing the class below them against the one above. It is just barely possible in my opinion that they may, under the guise of breaking the trust and liberating the "dear people," be able to drive out the present oligarchs, seat themselves, and become thoroughly intrenched before the people awaken to realize the fact that they have only changed masters. But I think it far more probable that it will amount to nothing more than a feint movement, or at the very most an earnest threat that they will assist the people to overthrow the whole capitalistic system, and by that means effect a compromise by which a considerable number may enter the "magic circle."

The oligarchy may thereby become greatly strengthened, possibly double in power. It will then have no commercial antagonist, none but the great plain people.

This final consolidation of the capitalistic forces will probably be done very quietly, secretly perhaps. The people may be made to believe that they have scored a great victory, and that that fond dream of the politicians, "the breaking of the trust," has at last been accomplished, that the great monster

has at last been destroyed, never more to raise his hideous form to menace the lives and happiness of a great and prosperous people, and much more to the same effect.

But what matter to the people whether their masters be ten thousand, one hundred thousand, or one million, so long as they are to be ground into profits. After the masters (those in the protected circle), have absorbed all the wealth of our own country and all the nooks and corners of the earth that have fallen to our lot in the scramble of the nations for markets, and when it is no longer possible to find a nation silly enough to buy more than it sells, then there will be no further opportunity for investment of profits, and then the piling up of profits as such will cease. In such case there might be a little difference to the people whether the masters are a large or small number, for then, there being no more place for investment of profits, the masters will plunge to the utmost limit in luxury, and the larger their number the less of labor's product will be left for the people. But in either case, their great fear will be the people, and after squandering all they possibly can on their own luxuries, a large part of the remainder must needs be distributed among the people in a way that will enable them to hold their prestige. Special privileges must be granted to favorites and to those who have influence with the people. Very little will be left to the masses.

With the continuance of our present system the people have nothing to hope for but to be ruled by some such oligarchy as I have here described, and nothing to expect from our rulers but crusts and virtually abject servitude. Monarchs have sometimes treated their subjects kindly, but an oligarchy never. Nothing can reasonably be expected but the most wanton luxury and extravagance on the one hand and the most degrading poverty and servitude on the other. The monarch may desire the esteem of all his subjects but an oligarchy cares not for the respect of those outside its own circle. Effect follows cause, and if a wealthy caste, say a million or half million people, having come into power by means of a scientific system of legalized robbery, holding their position by an organized system of corruption, accustomed to the most wanton luxuries with its accompanying vices and excesses, and used to thinking of the common people as far beneath them, it would certainly be a new thing under the sun if a caste trained in such a school should develop a degree of unselfishness and sympathy for, and kindness toward, the common people, that would prompt them to begin to deprive themselves of any considerable portion of the luxuries which they are wont to enjoy and use it in bettering the people's condition.

Seeing the present regime promises nothing but slavery to the people, we turn now to inquire what they may do for themselves. The common people, having so great a majority, if they would thoroughly unite and organize, could do almost anything that is within the range of human possibility. Having the ballot in their hands, they could soon capture the government and make it a government of the whole people instead of a few. To "know their rights and knowing, dare maintain," is the matter of first importance.

Since the wealth is the people's, and human welfare is the highest basis of right, they would be perfectly justified in taking possession of the whole wealth of the nation, if by so doing they could advance the general welfare, and dividing it equally among the whole people. Or, if they found it practicable, they might vary the share of each one according as he is more or less deserving. Exact justice would, of course, be impossible, but providing for the general welfare would cure all defects. There are two general ways by which the people might do this: One, by a sudden general confiscation and distribution; the other, by a gradual process which might be accomplished by heavy graduated income taxes, inheritance taxes and other forms of taxation, providing by legislation for higher wages to be paid to the workers and a great many other devices, but it would all amount to the same thing, confiscation, since it would only be a different method of taking the wealth from those who now have it, or it might be more perfectly termed a restoration, since it would be to a great extent a restoring of the property to its rightful owners.

Now, the question that comes in here is, would such a course be wise? That is to say, would it advance the general welfare? I should not like to say that it would not be any benefit to the people. Looking on our present chaotic, anarchistic form of society, with all its commercial tyranny, it does not seem that it could be much worse, and yet it might be. I do say, however, that such a thing would not be worth the doing if we are to go on in the same old way with the same old industrial system. Man has learned the trick of trust formation, and it would not be long till we would have the same picture of millionaires and paupers, etc.

The people might enact laws prohibiting anyone from owning more than his share of that form of wealth called "capital." By this means it might be arranged so that each one would enjoy an approximately just share of the product. Possibly the condition of the people might be greatly improved by this method, but there would certainly be found to be some very serious objections. Some of the people would be too indolent or selfish or wanting in intelligence to use their

share of the capital well, or too impracticable or disagreeable of disposition to join their capital with that of others in such business as requires an aggregation of capital. As a consequence, production might become very seriously reduced. So large a number of individual stockholders as would be necessary to operate a great manufacturing or transportation industry, could not work so well together in a competitive struggle with many other groups. Great enterprises would be likely to lag under such a regime. It might be arranged so as to allow one person to own \$50,000, \$100,000 or \$500,000, but that would soon divide the wealth among a number, each holding the maximum amount, or nearly so, while practically all the rest would have next to nothing. The same picture of wealth (in smaller piles), on the one hand and poverty on the other.

Competition is exceedingly wasteful. Being based upon selfishness, any form of it must be attended with more or less of rapacity and ruthlessness. In a sense it transforms human beings into savage beasts, preying upon each other, and nothing can prevent it but such a detailed system of governmental intervention as would render it a new system with the competition feature practically eliminated. The fact is, competition is dead; and any effort to restore it as a living force, by bolstering up with human laws, must prove as fruitless as to attempt to restore life to a corpse by setting props about it.

The trust, which is the final culmination of the competitive system, has introduced co-operation, a much more effective industrial principle than competition. It has been proven to be far more economical and successful; it suggests what seems to me the only possible way out of our dilemma, and that is to expand the trust so as to include all the people on an equal, an equitable footing. In such case, the co-operation being based on unselfishness, would be attended by qualities of human action directly the opposite of those mentioned as attending competition. It is along these lines that we must look for a remedy for the ills that afflict society, for competition fails utterly to furnish anything worthy of our consideration. The fact is that the trust has broken competition, and it cannot be mended, and I feel sure that after we have made the right application of the new principle which the trust has introduced, we will consider it not worth the mending, in fact will be glad that it cannot be mended.

I say competition is broken. I mean so far as the capitalists are concerned. The mass of the people, the manual laborer who works for a wage, the professional man, the small manufacturer, the retail dealer and the farmer—all virtually wage workers, who, if not for a daily wage, virtually work by

the piece—are still subject to the same law of competition. It is only to a very limited extent that these have availed themselves of the use of the trust principle, this being especially true of the farmer.

CHAPTER VI.

GLANCING BACKWARD AND FORWARD.

Before taking up the new line suggested, let us briefly glance backward, and then forward.

We have examined the philosophy of the formation and workings of the competitive system. We have found that it was born and nurtured in selfishness, was attended with all the characteristics of selfishness, and has grown and developed until it has finally culminated and ripened into the trust, the most striking personification of selfishness that could be imagined. The competitive system through its modern capitalistic development, has performed a great work in the world's progress, not so much in providing for present human happiness, as in bringing society to a point where this may be realized in the future. Human progress moves on, though the competitive road, for a large part of the people, is a hard road to travel. This ruthless, wicked system has now found its end in its own culmination, that most selfish monster, the trust. The trust has both substituted and proven the effectiveness of the new principle, which, when rightly applied, will lay the foundation for a new civilization, in which unselfishness with all its attendant characteristics and virtues, may take the place of selfishness with all its attendant characteristics and vices.

When I contemplate all this my heart is thrilled with admiration; my soul is filled with awe, and I am led to exclaim, "The hand of God is in all this! Even now the Divine hand is beckoning us onward! The Divine finger is pointing out to us the pathway to the new civilization."

We have traced man's industrial development, beginning with savagery, running through all the successive stages of chattel slavery, serfdom and the wage system or capitalism, and now see capitalism rapidly approaching its climax under trust combination. We have examined these three industrial forms and found them to be so many methods of exploiting the labor of the workers.

Passing by chattel slavery, which is slavery pure and simple, we come to serfdom, which also we find to be slavery, not so simple, but under the guise of a partial freedom. It

varies little from the simple form except in outward appearance.

Then coming to the wage system we find what seems at first, and what has passed for centuries as entire freedom. But when we come to analyze it we find that it too is slavery. Under all these forms there has been much injustice perpetrated against the workers. At first glance it would seem that the chattel slave had the greatest reason to complain, the serf the next, and the wage slave the least. Then, when we look at it from a purely financial or dollar standpoint we find it reversed. Each enslavement was a robbery whenever and by whatever the value of the slave's labor exceeded the value of his food, clothing, shelter and protection. Now, since under both chattel slavery and serfdom there is often no excess, and since the greatest excess is found under wage slavery, therefore, looking from this point of view, the wage worker of the present has the greatest grievance.

But there is another and higher view point, and from this it is again reversed. The consciousness of being held as a mere thing, mere property, a mere commercial chattel, subject to every whim of a master, was extremely degrading to the mind and self respect of the slave. The greatest injury was to his manhood. Under serfdom there was a little of the forms and outward appearance of liberty. It is probable that the serf did not often realize how little liberty he had, and although the blow to his manhood was not so great as to that of the chattel slave, yet it was his greatest injury.

The wage slave escapes most of the degrading features of chattel slavery; nevertheless, the money standard for measuring people is adhered to to such an extent, and the material condition of a large per cent of our wage workers, especially in the great cities, is so low, and they are made to feel their inferiority and degradation so keenly, that, notwithstanding the extent of the financial robbery to which they are subjected, it may be truly said that their greatest injury is to their manhood, although the injury in this respect is not so great as that done to the chattel slave.

There may, however, be another reversal of this if present tendencies continue. Take the California farm hand, for instance, who carries his blankets with him and sleeps wherever night overtakes him; always called a hobo, except where he stops and works long enough and hard enough to prove that he is not. Rather hard to develop manhood under such circumstances. Again, look at the sweat house or factory worker with his pitiful wage, his family crowded into a vile, reeking tenement with only a chalk mark to separate them from others. Think of the many thousands of these and of

the thousands of children whose young lives are being ground into dollars. The condition of thousands upon thousands is so desperate that it were better to take one's chances as a chattel slave under such average conditions as existed in the generations past; and millions more are in circumstances not much different. In all these there is not much opportunity to develop manhood.

Since, as we have seen, there could have been no civilization without labor, and since the condition of the workers has been, on the whole, better than to have remained in savagery, therefore it is better for the workers of all classes that civilization came by the road it did, than not to have come at all; society has been greatly blessed by the labor that has been performed.

Considering the nature of man, civilization must needs have travelled by the road it has; and here we observe that the exploiting principle, like the competitive principle, is based on man's selfishness and occupies an important place in social development through the primitive stages of society, which includes the present and must include so much of the future as is governed by these selfish principles.

There are many things in our present social status to indicate that society is getting about ripe for a change. Prominent among these are, first, the destruction of competition and the substitution and proving of the new principle, co-operation, and, secondly, the continually increasing number of the wretchedly destitute and miserable. About all that now seems wanting in the ripening process is that the people, the millions of great plain people, with ballots in their hands, shall learn what the trouble is and the remedy. When they do this we will be ready to move forward.

It is in the hope that I may be able to do something toward hastening this educational work that I devote my limited strength to writing this work. By the perusal of what has gone before I trust the reader may obtain a tolerably thorough and comprehensive view of the position that society now occupies, may be able to see that there is no turning back, and that our present order promises nothing but increased injustice, hardship, misery and degradation for nearly all the people, and that the only hope that presents itself is to leave the old hulk and move forward. Of course, the reader will want to know something of what the line of march shall be and the reason for it; and that we shall attempt to make plain in our exposition of Socialism, a theoretical system of society in which it is proposed that the new principle, co-operation, now used selfishly by the trust, shall be used unselfishly as the chief industrial principle.

Starting with human nature as it is, and knowing that the character of man is always determined in great measure by the industrial principles that he practices, it is hoped that by the introduction of industrial principles based on unselfishness, the good that is in human nature may have an opportunity to rise instead of being checked and smothered as is the case to-day. We cannot go back to the old log cabin days; nor do we desire to. We have learned a better way. We cannot restore competition; and why should we desire to? We certainly should hope that there is a better way.

There is another very important point that we must consider before closing this chapter; and that is the danger of anarchy if the process of wealth concentration is permitted to go much further. If our civilization would make sure of avoiding the fate of Rome, that is to say, of falling by the weight of its own rottenness and corruption, she should beware of continuing much further on the road she is now travelling. Glancing at the history of all the great nations of the past we cannot but feel that there is undoubtedly a great danger ahead.

Considering the whole situation as we have it now before us, the important question is not whether Socialism can be made to work easily, but whether it can be made to work at all. The case resolves itself into this: That the choice lies between Socialism on the one hand and capitalistic tyranny and slavery on the other, with a very strong probability of ending in a period of disastrous anarchy. We are in a dilemma, and Socialism is the only way out. Socialism must come sooner or later. The question is, will the people be wise enough to introduce it without the lesson of a great catastrophe?

Some years ago a populist writer illustrated the danger ahead by saying that society is in the Niagara River drifting rapidly toward the Falls, and that our only escape is by cutting our Welland Canal. Transforming and enlarging, we have it thus: Lake Erie represents competition in which society has been sailing for the past four thousand years. The upper Niagara is the narrowing of the people's liberties that followed the amassing of great fortunes consequent on the introduction of machinery. The great falls or cataract represents the catastrophe that certainly awaits us if the trustification continues. The waters beyond the cataract represent the condition of society beyond the point where calamity must be experienced or averted. Now then, our old ship of state has left the old lake where the sailing was not always smooth, has passed the first rapids, where she parted from competition never more to return to it. We are now in rough waters,

moving at a rapid rate. On our entrance into the river an alarm was sounded but little heeded. Since we entered the rapids an ever increasing number have kept the alarm bells continually ringing. Recently there has been a great awakening. The great body of the passengers have become aroused and are manifesting signs of great uneasiness. In fact, there is somewhat of a flurry. "What is to be done?" is heard from all quarters. Listen. First, keep cool; don't get excited. The danger is near, but may be easily averted if only we act promptly, and earnestly, and unitedly. Our cherished old vessel is imprisoned in turbulent waters. We cannot retrace our steps. We are drifting madly toward the great cataract, where we must soon make the plunge to our destruction unless we act at once and do something to avert it. There is just one thing we can do. We must at once bring our vessel to anchor and proceed to dig our Welland Canal, so that we may be able to conduct our ship safely around the great cataract, and, may we not hope, to successfully readjust our sails in a manner suited to our environment and be able to steer proudly out into the grand and beautiful lake beyond?

The success of this canal enterprise will require the combined intelligence of the whole people. It will not do to trust to leaders knowing and doing the right thing. To adopt such a course would be to play into the hands of the enemy. The influence of wealth would secure leaders that would be in league with the wealthy class, and they would only laugh at all warnings. "This is fine! Who cares for the rapids? We do not see any falls! Let her drive! Whoop, hurrah!" The only safe course is for the people, or a very large proportion (the only danger is that it will not be large enough) of them, to become well informed on this subject, for as many as possible to acquire a thorough knowledge of the underlying principles connected with it, and their relation to each other, and, in short, the philosophy of the whole situation. There are few of those of even very meagre education who would not be able to understand these principles if only they would apply their minds earnestly. It is far easier to learn principles than men. If the people understood the principles thoroughly a way could be provided whereby they could hold the leaders whom they elect in strict line with those principles, and it would be much more satisfactory than our present method, which is to guess at the men (it is the best we can do with men), and trust to them to understand and follow right principles.

CHAPTER VII.

Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
 Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
 Given to redeem the human mind from error,
 There were no need of arsenals or forts.—Longfellow.

ORIGIN AND DEFINITIONS OF SOCIALISM.

As to origin, it doesn't matter whether the Socialistic idea be an evolution, invention, doctrine or discovery; the idea is here, and what are we going to do about it is the question.

"A theory of society that advocates a more precise, orderly and harmonious arrangement of the social relations of mankind than that which has hitherto prevailed."—Webster.

"The abolition of that individual action on which modern societies depend, and the substitution of a regulated system of co-operative action."—Imperial Dictionary.

"The ethics of Socialism are identical with the ethics of Christianity."—Encyclopedia Britannica.

"The answer of Socialism to the capitalist is that society can do without him just as society now does without the slave owner and the feudal lord; both were formerly regarded as necessary to the well being and even the very existence of society."—Prof. Clarke.

"No thinking man will contradict that associated industry is the most powerful agent of production, and that the principles of association are susceptible of further and beneficial development."—John Stuart Mill.

"Socialism being the product of social evolution, the only danger lies in obstructing it."—Rev. F. M. Sprague.

"Socialism is the idea and hope of a new society founded on industrial peace and forethought, aiming at a new and higher life for all men."—William Morris.

"Government and co-operation are in all things and eternally the laws of life; anarchy and competition, eternally and in all things the laws of death."—John Ruskin.

"To the foregoing the writer would add another definition of Socialism. Socialism would solve the labor problem by guaranteeing to the producer the full product of his toil; the prison reform problem by removing the incentive to crime; the temperance problem by taking out of the scheme of life the only incentive which ever induced any man or woman to keep a saloon, a gambling house or a brothel; the immigration problem by establishing a system of industry in which every day of idleness would be (as it is now) a loss to society, and in which every day of added labor would be a decided gain to all the inhabitants of the commonwealth. In a word, Socialism would make possible a fulfillment of the teachings of the greatest of all Socialists, in universal brotherhood among men, peace on earth, and plenty for all the children of a common Father."—A. M. Dewey.

Who Is a Socialist? By Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

"Who is a Socialist? It is the man
 Who strives to formulate or aid a plan
 To better earth's conditions. It is he
 Who, having ears to hear and eyes to see,

Is neither deaf nor blind when might, roughshod,
 Treads down the privileges and rights which God
 Means for all men; the privilege to toil,
 To breathe pure air, to till the fertile soil—
 The right to live, to love, to woo, to wed,
 And earn for hungry mouths their need of bread.
 The Socialist is he who claims no more
 Than his own share from generous Nature's store;
 But that he asks, and asks, too, that no other
 Shall claim the share of any weaker brother,
 And brand him beggar in his own domain,
 To glut a mad, inordinate lust for gain.
 The Socialist is one who holds the best
 Of all God's gifts is toil; the second, rest.
 He asks that all men learn the sweets of labor,
 And that no idler fatten on his neighbor;
 That all men be allowed their share of leisure,
 Nor thousands slave that one may seek his pleasure.
 Who on the Golden Rule shall dare insist,
 Behold in him the modern Socialist.

In order to make clearer the definition of Socialism, and the objects which it is intended to accomplish, and also for future reference in this work, we insert here an extract from an address by Frances E. Willard, delivered at the National W. C. T. U. Convention at Buffalo, in 1897, which is as follows:

"Look about you; the products of labor are on every hand; you could not maintain for a moment a well ordered life without them; every object in your room has in it, for discerning eyes, the mark of ingenious tools and the pressure of labor's hands. But is it not the cruelest injustice for the wealthy, whose lives are surrounded and embellished by labor's work, to have a superabundance of the money which represents the aggregate of labor in any country while the laborer himself is kept so steady at work that he has no time to acquire the education and refinements of life that would make him and his family agreeable companions to the rich and cultured? The reason why I am a Socialist comes in just here.

"I would take, not by force, but by the slow process of lawful acquisition through better legislation as the outcome of a wiser ballot in the hands of men and women, the entire plant that we call civilization, all that has been achieved on this continent in the 400 years since Columbus wended his way hither, and make it the common property of all the people, requiring all to work enough with their hands to give them the finest physical development but not to become burdensome in any case, and permitting all to share alike the advantages of education and refinement. I believe this to be perfectly practicable; indeed, that any other method is simply a relic of barbarism.

"I believe that competition is doomed. The trusts, whose single object is to abolish competition, have proved that we are better off without it than with it, and the moment corporations control the supply of any article they combine. What the Socialist desires is that the corporation of humanity should control all production. Beloved comrades, this is the frictionless way; it is the higher law; it eliminates the motives for a selfish life; it enacts into our every day living the ethics of Christ's gospel. Nothing else will do it; nothing else can bring the glad day of universal brotherhood.

"Oh, that I were young again and it would have my life! It is God's way out of the wilderness and into the promised land. It is the very marrow of Christ's gospel. It is Christianity applied."

But the definition that I prefer as a working basis in the treatment of this subject is that given by Richard T. Ely, Professor of Political Economy and Director of the School of Economics, Political Science and History, in the University of Wisconsin:

"Socialism is that contemplated system of individual society which proposes the abolition of private property in the great material instruments of production, and the substitution therefor of collective property, and advocates the collective management of production, together with the distribution of social income by society, and private property in the larger proportion of this social income."

This definition, however, leaves in the background the central point in Socialism, which is the substitution of co-operation for competition.

Following the line of Professor Ely's arrangement, let us elaborate the definition somewhat.

Elements of Socialism.

1. Common Ownership. The enlargement of the powers of government until it shall own nearly all the capital and control the rest. The government must own all the capital in those industries that tend toward monopoly. It may be found more convenient, especially in the initial stages, to permit some of the smaller branches of production to be conducted by private enterprise; and besides, Socialism proposes to make people happier; and if it should be found that there are persons who have become so habituated to a certain way of procuring a living that they could not be happy in any other way, then it would be the business of the government to make provision accordingly; but to permit those engaged in private enterprise to receive more for their labor than those in the public employ, would be contrary alike to sound policy and the spirit of Socialism. On the contrary, such a course should be pursued as will continually reduce private enterprise to narrower and narrower limits until it entirely disappears.

2. Common Management. Under our present system goods are produced for profit and often the profits increase with the scarcity; but under Socialism goods will be produced for the sole purpose of supplying the wants of the people, and the greater the supply the greater the cause for rejoicing. It will be the duty of the government to provide for each person who is able, to earn his living at some useful employment, and in doing this it will be the further duty of the government to use its utmost endeavor to so distribute the various occupa-

tions among the people as will best promote the happiness of all.

3. **Distribution of Income by Common Authority.** One of the chief objects and strong features of Socialism is its distributive justice. One of its leading principles is equality; but it requires that equal enjoyment of social income must be preceded by equal effort in production. If a man will not work neither shall he eat. The theory of Socialism regards all capital as the common inheritance, so that those who are disabled and incapacitated share equally in its common ownership. It also regards the state as an insurance company, insuring all its members against disability of every kind, so that those who are unfortunate may share their full portion and not experience the humiliation of feeling that they are paupers.

4. **Private Property in the Larger Part of Income.** Some advocates of capitalism claim that private property is necessary to man's highest development; and Socialism replies that capitalism fails to furnish each one with the private property he needs. Socialism proposes to provide for each one to hold for his own private use a just share of the social income.

The following from Professor Ely's work, "Socialism and Social Reform," page 38, is inserted to show the character of the advocates of Socialism:

"It is essential to the comprehension of the nature of Socialism to know that it is a system of industrial society which has found advocates among many gifted, learned and very practical men. The leaders of Socialism in the present century have generally been men of extraordinary capacity, placing them far above the ordinary man."

To show this author's high opinion of Socialism we quote from page 145:

"It may be said, indeed, that nothing in the present day is so likely to awaken the conscience of the ordinary man or woman, or to increase the sense of individual responsibility as a thorough course in Socialism. The study of Socialism has proved the turning point in thousands of lives and converted self seeking men and women into self sacrificing toilers for the masses."

Socialism is especially attractive to poets, artists, authors, scholars, philosophers and humanitarians. Until within a very few years back it was very unpopular, but now its popularity is increasing with an accelerated velocity. People no longer require to be reassured that Socialism does not mean anarchism and everything that is hateful and dangerous. One can now avow himself a Socialist without having the word "Shame!" hurled into his face. A few years ago a Socialist writer could show that he was in good company by scraping together a list of a few renowned and untarnished names like those of John Ruskin, William Morris, Walter Crane, Hall Caine and William Dean Howells, but now it is different.

Now the people are becoming so dissatisfied with present conditions and are turning to Socialism to such an extent, that our leading papers are finding it necessary, in order to hold their patronage, to advocate "Socialism or something like it;" for publishers must offer for sale what the people want to buy, or go out of business.

What is Not Socialism.

1. **Anarchism.** Anarchism is a proposed scheme of society in which there shall be no physical force or compulsion, the only restraint being that which each individual puts upon himself. Practically, anarchism is the absence of all law, of which the history of the past furnishes numerous instances, and these were almost invariably attended with crime and bloodshed owing to the presence of a considerable turbulent and criminal element. This fact has caused the word "Anarchy" to become associated with scenes of violence until it has become very difficult for us to disconnect the word from all that is vicious and dangerous and the fact that anarchy seeks the same equality as Socialism, has caused the two to become somewhat confused in the minds of some, bringing Socialism to that extent into disrepute; and it cannot be disputed that capitalism has done its utmost to encourage the misapprehension. The original meaning of anarchy or anarchism does not include the idea of violence. It is easy to imagine a people of so high a type morally that they could dwell together harmoniously without the necessity of exercising any compulsion or restraint upon any of its members. Accordingly we find such writers as Count Tolstoi and Prince Kropotkin under the name of anarchism spinning fine theories and picturing a beautiful far-away society where the only law shall be the law of Christ and the only restraint, self-restraint. Such writings sown broadcast among a poverty-stricken, ignorant and more or less criminally inclined people, smarting under political and industrial tyranny caused by unjust laws, can have but one effect. With such a picture and such a people, and a few unprincipled leaders to harangue them, they become easily imbued with the idea that the law is their bitterest enemy, and that the true remedy for the ills that afflict society, is to be found in the abrogation of all law.

Since anarchism is negative and has little or nothing in the way of a reconstructive plan, these people are left to look for their own remedies, and the bomb is a natural result. The criminally inclined always smart under the restraints of law, and often exert an influence on those who are more peacefully inclined.

This "beautiful theory," called philosophic anarchism, presents a conception of what may be a remote future possibility. The picture is drawn on a high moral plane to be sure, but with a very unsightly background; for I understand that all anarchistic philosophers either declare with Tolstoi in favor of abandoning all pursuits excepting agriculture and handicraft, thus doing away with machinery entirely, or advocate social theories which would forbid its use excepting on a very small scale. They would take us back to "the good old log cabin days," or the mud hut, or the shack, and it is not hard to find these even now. The two conceptions are incongruous. I fear that such a high moral plane could never be attained in the midst of a material environment so semi-barbaric and rude.

But all these foolish speculations might be harmless if it were not that the leading feature is to do away with the law. Anarchism proposes little or no organization, not even an organized effort to disorganize our present society. They don't try to capture the government in a legal way that they may decide by a majority vote to do away with all government and cease voting. Organization is inconsistent with their principles.

Anarchism is the result of capitalism on the principle that one extreme leads to another. It is characteristic of ignorance that it always runs to extremes. In France, before the Revolution, the people became aware that they were being trampled into the dust by the king, the nobility and the priesthood, and they imagined that when they had finished killing all these aristocratic classes they would be happy. And so, now, there are people so ignorant that when they learn that all the injustice and misery which they suffer is the result of pernicious laws they go to the extreme of supposing that all laws are necessarily bad, and foolishly imagine that their destruction would usher in an era of happiness.

Anarchism is the result of a good thought, misapprehended and misapplied. The good thought consists of a conception of that very high ideal of society, a society in which the moral plane is so high that compulsion by physical force is no longer necessary. The misapprehension consists of an incoherent understanding of what constitutes a necessary part of this ideal. As nearly as I can gather, the anarchistic philosophers, from contemplating the absence of penal laws, which this ideal involves, fell into the error of considering all laws obnoxious and at enmity with it. Recognizing the fact that law is but a rule of action, without which there can be no organization or concerted action, they rejected these from their creed, counting the prescribing of one's action by

any other person or persons, even with his own voice and consent, as a disturbance of his happiness. Then, it would seem, from this they came to consider the absence of law as the cause of the high moral plane. Thus, by a loose-jointed, slipshod jumbling of ideas, they evolved a distorted ideal. In truth, however, the absence of penal law is only an incident to the high ideal and not the cause of it. The beauty and practical utility of the conception is in the moral virtue of society and the absence of a necessity for penal laws is given as a measure of that virtue. It is a great mistake to suppose that one's happiness is in the least reduced because he regulates his conduct by rules made by others, in the making of which he has or has not a voice, provided such rules are agreeable to him and such regulation is entirely voluntary on his part; and since these rules must be presented to him, subject to the approval or disapproval of his judgment, he has perfect liberty. Penal laws for the restraint of wrongdoers do not affect his liberty or his happiness; and this view of the matter saves to society another ideal that anarchism throws to the winds, which is very important, even for the beauty there is in it, but infinitely more so for its practical utility. I mean that of perfectly concerted action. In the matter of practical utility the former of the two ideals we have just mentioned may be considered the captain of all ideals, and the latter, the first lieutenant. Human virtue and concerted action are alike absolutely essential to society, and to dismiss the lieutenant as anarchism proposes, could have no other effect than the dissolution of society.

Having misapprehended and misassociated this highest ideal and discarded its indispensable assistant, the anarchistic philosophers proceeded to do what? To formulate a plan for the reorganization of society? No, hardly that: organization implies rules for concerted action; such rules are simply laws, and laws are what they are trying especially to avoid. They hardly dare suggest a method or plan of action of any kind, because it would be virtually a law. The fact is, their theory carried them backward beyond the confines of civilization; but having tasted the sweets of civilized life, they did not like their surroundings; so they concluded to recross the line and come back just a little way. A very little reflection was sufficient to show the impossibility of any civilization without some concerted action, some rules or laws, and they seem to have imagined that by their small group society they might reduce the laws to the minimum and do away entirely with the most objectionable form, penal laws. Since their theory cuts off organization, even in doing away with our present system, they could only advocate the

idea that its dissolution would eventually come about somehow, giving opportunity for the application of their "beautiful philosophy of anarchism."

This "beautiful theory," especially that part which relates to the abolition of all punishments, is attractive to the criminal classes, who, becoming impatient for its realization, fall upon the group idea as a way of getting rid of our present system. Accordingly, they begin to group themselves into ways and means committees, and with their pockets full of bombs, proceed to hasten the dissolution of society. No wonder so many find it difficult to understand the teachings of anarchism; its doctrine seems to be mostly negative.

2. **Communism.** The term communism includes any form of common ownership society which is merely local in its operations. In various parts of the world communistic experiments have been tried. A very large number of these communities or colonies have been planted in the United States. Most of them failed. There were a great many reasons for these failures. A very large proportion were religious societies. Many of them were drawn together by what other people call fanaticism of one kind or another, and it was said that when the fanaticism died away there was not enough adhesiveness to hold them together. The influence upon the young of their outside neighbors and of the outside inducements in a comparatively new country, the inclination of people to change from place to place, a change often necessary for health, strife among leaders and personal bickerings due to the smallness of the communities—these were all fruitful sources of disruption. But there is little in the history of these societies that is of any value in the discussion of Socialism, excepting on one point, and that is that getting the men to work satisfactorily was the least of the difficulties with which they had to contend.

3. **Unionism.** As little similarity as there is between unionism and Socialism, we often hear people say when the subject of Socialism is mentioned, "Oh, I don't have any use for the unions." As a matter of fact, they have very little in common, so far as principles and methods are concerned. True, some Socialists are labor unionists, and vice versa, some labor unionists are Socialists. Both are organized to fight a common enemy—the capitalistic system, but their methods of warfare are very different. Unionism acknowledges the rightful supremacy of capitalism, Socialism denies it; unionism asks for part of the rights of those within its own circle, Socialism demands the full measure of justice to all the people; unionism petitions for redress of grievances and pro-

poses to remain subject to capitalism; Socialism means complete revolution and proclaims a war of extermination against capitalism. This may sound ferocious. But don't be alarmed; it is only capitalism that is to be exterminated; the capitalist himself is to be left free to breathe his part of the pure air, drink his part of the pure water, receive and enjoy his part of the product that labor draws from the beautiful green earth and bask in his part of the pleasant sunshine, just like anybody else.

Socialism is pre-eminently for peace. It is much more peaceful than unionism. Unionism relies on brute force methods. In the past unionism often went into the fight armed only with the fists or at most with clubs, stones and brickbats, and, of course, it was defeated when it came in contact with bayonets. Now, pitting its dollars against those of capitalism, it sits down quietly and thinks to starve the enemy into submission. This would be about as foolish, were it not for two circumstances; first, the greed of the capitalists, who are often ready to compromise in order to resume the accumulation of profits, and second, the fear that refusal of the union's demands will drive it to political action and lead it to Socialism. Socialism proposes that the many workers pit their ballots against the ballots of the idle few. Unionism is valuable chiefly as an educator; and, strange to say, its best lessons are found in its failures. Capitalism understands this perfectly. Capitalism doesn't want the workers to learn. She also knows that the average unionist is pretty well satisfied if he can gain one strike in about four or five and can manage to get along if he can gain one in ten; therefore capitalism permits the unions to gain a strike occasionally or think they have gained it. If all the charges against unionism are true, it is only a further reason for Socialism.

To show how the education comes in we insert the following from "The Appeal to Reason," September 24, 1906:

"Smashing the Union' in Australia. 'The Crushing Out of Labor Organizations Has Resulted in the Development of a Powerful Socialist Party.' Hugh O'Neil in Kansas City Independent, organ of the National Manufacturer's Association, and reprinted in the National Civic Federation Review.

"It was Malcolm Donald McEacharn, ship owner and capitalist, who delivered the Commonwealth of Australia to the Socialists. He is the one conservative on the continent that the Socialists fight without malice.

"Of course, McEacharn didn't want Socialism. He only wanted to break the power of the trades unions. He thought that their exactions had become intolerable, and there was some justification for that view. Strikes were common, and frequently the cause of quarrel was trivial. But the strikers were always successful because the country was being flooded with British money, and the voice of the boomster was abroad in the land. The union leaders were ignorant of all economic laws, and they

mistook the existing condition for one of natural prosperity. (That's where they made their mistake.)

"McEacharn knew better than that. He knew that the burst would come sooner or later, and he prepared to attack labor on a falling market. He figured to smash the unions and remove the heel of aggressive democracy from the throat of capital. A partial victory was not what he wanted. He was after the whole hog. He got it. (That's where he made his mistake.)

"The unionists were lions led by asses. McEacharn knew that. Time after time the shipping union made demands upon his company; time after time he granted these demands, with smiling readiness. But day after day he went on building together the units of a force to fight unionism that was destined to sweep organized labor out of existence. The plan was colossal, but the solid patience with which in the meantime he bore the galling exactions of the trades was quite as great.

"And then, one day, he loosed his thunders and struck hard and straight and true. He chose the time of battle, the cause of battle, and the place of battle. The unions chose nothing. They were arrogant with riches.

"The cause of quarrel was childish, as McEacharn meant it should be. A difference arose between the quartermaster and the steward of one of his coasting steamers over the charms of a stewardess. The captain, to settle the difficulty—as he thought, poor man—discharged the sailor. The union demanded his reinstatement. McEacharn, knowing what the reply would be, offered to put him on another ship. The union demanded reinstatement on the same ship. McEacharn in very courteous terms pointed out that that was impossible. Then the asses who led the lions told him that unless the reinstatement was effected within twenty-four hours they would call the crews off all his ships and order a general strike.

"Then, like a flash, McEacharn unmasked his guns. Back went the reply that the unions might strike and be damned.

"The strike was ordered. And then there followed a battle grim and great. Union after union was called out, ship after ship was laid up, state after state was involved in the quarrel, until the whole continent stood under arms. In less than four weeks the fires of nearly every coasting steamer were drawn. The trade of Australia was paralyzed. Four hundred thousand unionists were idle, and every man of them was drawing half pay. Also every unemployed man who looked like becoming a free laborer was paid a weekly allowance from the general fund to prevent remanning the ships.

"But the Shipowners' Union that McEacharn had organized didn't even try to reman the ships. The land boom had reached its limit, trade was declining, very large coal reserves had been laid up, the funds and membership of the unions were known to a dollar and a man. The ship-owners simply sat down on their hunkers and waited.

"Starvation won easily. Ten weeks after the first shot the unions capitulated to the grim foe hunger, that before then had bowed the neck of many a proud city. McEacharn had meant to break the unions. And they were broken all right.

"Funds gone, membership decimated, courage wilted, the once great trade unions of Australia were counted out.

"The capitulation was announced in the biggest public hall the labor leaders could get. John Hancock, big bodied and big hearted—the finest platform man in Australia—rose in that hall of silent hundreds to tell the men that they must return to work on the best terms they could get. It was the shortest and most pregnant speech he ever made in his life.

'Friends,' he said, 'men of Australia, we have not been beaten; we have been starved into submission. Unionism is dead, but anything can happen in a democracy, and from the ashes of the funeral pyre that the ship-owners have lighted will rise the phoenix of our liberties.'

"Nobody knew what he meant. It is doubtful whether he knew himself. But it sounded large and fine, and something with that sort of sound was just what those depressed people wanted that night. But one year later big John Hancock took his seat in Parliament—the first labor member sent in by the first labor party in Australia.

"Vanquished in the industrial war, the members of the battered trades unions had reorganized their forces on a political basis and sought to win by the ballot the privileges capital had denied them. Someone discovered that where all men have votes and the bulk of men are wage earners they only have to decide among themselves what they want from the state to get it.

"That was only ten years ago. And now they have gotten nearly all they wanted. Think of it. Eleven years ago the unions were battered, dead, done for. To-day their direct lineal successor owns the whole blessed commonwealth of Australia.

"They attacked municipal councils first, and enforced the minimum wage and eight hour day on all of them. They attacked the state parliaments next and gained factory legislation and old age pensions and compulsory arbitration. No factory in the country can now employ child labor or work its people more than eight hours per day, or pay less than the minimum wage fixed by the wages board. In two of the six states the labor party are the government in office, in two others they hold the balance of power, and in two others they are the direct opposition.

"But it is their success in the commonwealth parliament—the National Assembly—that marks out Australia as a Socialistic nation.

"In the Senate half the members are pledged Socialists—definite servants of the labor party. In the Representatives the direct opposition are pledged Socialists also—members of the same party. Compulsory arbitration in labor disputes is the law actually operating in two of the states, and the national legislature has passed a law enforcing compulsory arbitration in any labor dispute that extends from one state to another."

The above article furnishes a very fitting illustration of the benefit that sometimes accrues to the unions from the loss of a strike. Such failures are the most effective lessons to teach them their political power. The beginner may be a little puzzled, however, at seeing that it was published in two prominent capitalist papers; but when he has studied thoroughly the subject of social reform, and learned what an elastic thing it is, he will come to understand what it means. When he has learned that social reform is usually little more than an inflated bubble, labelled Socialism, for the purpose of leading Socialists away from Socialism, he will understand why the above article found space in capitalist papers, why the Australian and New Zealand reform measures are called Socialism, why the Australian Labor Party is called a Socialist party, and why the compulsory arbitration law is paraded in capitalist papers as a great Socialist victory, and will then begin to realize that capitalism has been playing with a card up its sleeve.

CHAPTER VIII.

WHAT IS NOT AND YET IS SOCIALISM; OR, SOCIAL REFORM.

Under this head is included all proposed governmental measures which are intended as remedies for the evils that afflict society, while at the same time retaining our present social order. Most of these are Socialistic in their tendencies, and this, with the fact that many Socialists favor social reform as an initial step to Socialism, causes social reform to be regarded by many as Socialism. In England and most of the Continental nations of Europe much has already been done in this line. In New Zealand the social reform forces have full sway and have brought about a great change, and now they are coming rapidly to the front. In this country the public sentiment is looming up very strongly for social reform. Experience, however, shows that it carries with it reactionary forces that greatly hinder its operation. With all the good that may be accomplished by social reform, it is only a tacking on of new cloth to an old garment, and the danger is that the rent may be made worse. This lets in the dragging back or reactionary forces. But what is the program of social reform? What is it doing? What does it propose? What can it do? What is and will be its effect on society?

Joseph Chamberlain, who now looms up as the leading English statesman, in rehearsing the great good wrought by reform legislation in that country, said: That in the last half century pauperism had greatly diminished; that the poor rate had been reduced to less than half what it was before the new poor law; that crime had diminished in both quantity and character; that education had been brought within the reach of every child; that protection had been afforded against excessive toil and overwork; that the observance of proper sanitary conditions for labor had been universally enforced; that trade unions had been legalized so that workmen might meet their employers on something like an equal footing in settling the rate of wages; that the care of the public health had been recognized; that the taxes on food and all other great necessities had been repealed; that facilities for travel and intercommunication had been greatly extended and developed; that opportunities for improvement and recreation had been afforded to all at the expense of the community, and that wages had increased fifty per cent while the hours of labor had been reduced twenty per cent. He also mentions the diminution in the death rate, and adds: "An impartial examination of the facts and figures here set forth must lead to

the conclusion that there has been a very great improvement in the condition of the people during the period under review, and this improvement has been largely due to the intervention of the state and to what is called Socialistic legislation. The acts for the regulation of mines and the inspection of factories and workshops, the Truck Act (preventing the payment of wages in kind), the acts relating to merchant shipping, the Artisans' Dwellings Act, the Allotments Act, the Education Act, the Poor Law, and the Irish Land Acts, are all of them measures which more or less limit and control individual action."

One of the main items in the program is public ownership of such industries as tend to become monopolies. Most of the European governments own and operate the railways, telegraphs and telephones. Most of their great cities, I believe, own their watering and lighting plants, street railways and city telephone systems. In this country the people are becoming awakened on the subject, and already considerable has been done.

But it is in New Zealand that the most decided steps have been taken in social reform; indeed, New Zealand has been called the experiment station of modern democracy.

If the reader will stop at this point and procure a copy of "New Zealand in a Nutshell," it will enable him to more thoroughly understand this part of our subject; but to those who do not find it convenient to do so we will state briefly that New Zealand is a province of Great Britain situated in the South Pacific, 1,200 miles southeast of Australia, having an area of 104,000 square miles, with a population in 1901 of 720,000. It consists of two large and several small islands that have a range of latitude extending from the 34th to the 47th parallels of south latitude. The climate is similar to California; the soil not generally very productive, and the country chiefly adapted to grazing. Quoting from the above-named work: "The soil, while fertile in patches, is only profitable when held in large blocks for cattle and sheep ranches. This led to land monopoly, and the few soon controlled, whereupon the people deliberately came together and wiped out the millionaire class of land grabbers, and now the motto is, 'No millionaires, no paupers.' New Zealand is no Utopia. Our people do not claim to have reached a final solution of any social problem, but they are trying to introduce methods that will make all comfortable, contented and happy."

The people govern, it is said, and it is said also that every effort is made to secure a still better system, but I cannot vouch for the truth of either of these statements.

The story of New Zealand is a pretty picture. Let us examine it somewhat closely and see what we may learn from it. The first, and perhaps most important, lesson is what the workers who have ballots in their hands may do to better their condition. It shows that they can have about what they want when they go at it right. It shows that a great and happy change may be wrought by granting to labor even a small part of what belongs to it. And the workers took it themselves; or, rather, they asked for it in a way that showed they meant to have it, and got what they asked for but no more, as we shall see presently.

It is certainly a beautiful picture as compared with society in this country. Those who but partially understand the Socialist ideal call it Socialism; and it is a movement in that direction; but, measured by the true Socialist ideal, it falls so far short that a Socialist can hardly help the suggestion that if Satan should slightly neglect the heating and fumigation of some remote corner of his domain, those happening to stray thither would fancy themselves in heaven.

Having shown some of the things which social reform is doing, we inquire next, what does it propose to do? We quote from Professor Ely's work, page 255, as follows:

"Can we not, in our industrial life, keep what we have that is valuable and escape some of the evils which Socialism has so vividly depicted? And let us frankly, fully, without equivocation, acknowledge the great services which Socialism has in this, as in other respects, rendered society. Can we not carefully, conservatively, add to our social order some of the strong features of Socialism, and yet keep this social order intact? It seems to the author that this is practicable, and the means for doing this he endeavors to describe as a program of practicable social reform, giving merely the outlines.

"Those who take up the subject of social reform at the present day must remember that they cannot accomplish much that is permanently valuable unless they start with a full knowledge of Socialism and its advantages, and attempt to realize those advantages. High ideals for the masses have been realized once for all.

"Some of the things which we must strive to accomplish in social reform may be enumerated as follows: First of all, we must seek a better realization of productive forces. This implies, negatively, that we should reduce the waste of the competitive system to its lowest possible terms; positively, that we should endeavor to secure a steady production, employing all available capital and labor power; furthermore, the full utilization of inventions and discoveries by a removal of the friction which often renders improvement so difficult. Positively this implies, also, that production should be carried on under wholesome conditions.

"In the second place, would we secure the advantages of Socialism, we must so mend our distribution of wealth that we shall avoid present extremes and bring about widely diffused comfort, making frugal comfort for all our aim. Distribution must be so shaped, if practicable, that all shall have assured incomes, but that no one who is personally qualified to render service shall enjoy an income without personal exertion.

"In the third place, there must be abundant public provision of

opportunity for the development of our faculties, including educational facilities and the large use of natural resources for purposes of recreation. One question which meets us at the threshold of our inquiries concerns the possibility of reform. Can we accomplish the ends which we have in view, and will the effort which we put forth to accomplish these ends meet with a return commensurate with the effort involved? It is frequently said that all our efforts amount to so little that it is not worth our while to try to improve society. When we look into the efforts to accomplish reform in the past we cannot find reason for discouragement; quite the contrary, well directed effort has accomplished great things; and we are warranted in the belief that a thorough reformation of society and the reduction of social evils to very low terms, if not a complete abolition, is practicable. The number of those who are submerged, large as it is, is comparatively small, giving, let us say, nine persons to help one of the fallen, and improvement among the nine-tenths is not difficult." (pp. 255-257.)

Now, I think we have the subject of social reform pretty well up before us.

And here is a convenient point to inquire just what is Socialistic? What is Socialism? What is social reform? What is the distinction between Socialism and social reform? And first, where does Socialism begin? To properly answer this question we must get down to fundamentals.

There are two fundamental principles which may and have governed industrial action—competition and co-operation. Competition is, as we have seen, the selfish, every-fellow-for-himself principle, adapted to man in the lower stages of civilization. Co-operation is the unselfish, help-one-another principle, adapted to man in the higher stages of civilization. Not only does one or the other of these two principles underlie all industrial action, but all political action as well; and why should it not? For we may say that, generally speaking, the political function is but the servant of the industrial function.

Out of the competitive principle have grown enmity, contention and crime of all sorts, including all wars and all inequalities of wealth; great riches on the one hand, and abject poverty on the other; palaces on the one hand, and hovels on the other—in short, our present society will all its monstrosities.

Through the right, or unselfish use of the co-operative principle, or Socialism, will come an era in which amity will take the place of enmity; the helping hand will take the place of contention; justice will take the place of injustice; crime will be reduced to the minimum, and, in time, almost or possibly wholly disappear; and by which means also will first be developed nationalism, which will later merge into internationalism, bringing universal justice, peace and good-will, finally realizing that fond dream of the ages, the universal brotherhood of man.

Competition is always selfish. It is not, however, necessarily always unjust. Competition usually misses justice very widely, and, as we have seen, the sum of all its action culminates finally in the grossest injustice.

Co-operation may be selfish or unselfish, and result in justice or injustice, depending on the nature of the case, the object of the co-operation, and the number of the co-operators.

Examples of wrong or unjust co-operation: When two men unite and pounce upon a third man and relieve him of his money or other effects; where the members of a tribe combine in a raid upon a weaker tribe for purposes of plunder, murder and enslavement; where a nation, by war or intimidation, takes an unjust advantage of another nation or people; where two or more people combine to raise or lower the price of an article so as to give them an unjust advantage over others; this last includes all operations of the trust.

Examples of right or just co-operation: Where two or more persons unite for self protection against thieves, robbers or savages; where a tribe or nation unite to resist the unjust encroachments of another tribe or nation, and, generally speaking, where any number of people unite either industrially or politically to resist the injustice of others, and to do anything for the promotion of their own interests that will not mitigate against the just rights of others.

Competition, together with other forms of selfishness from which it springs, has filled the world with contentions, strifes, discords, jars, fightings and wars. The wisest were the first to discover the principle that in union there is strength; hence, in the political field, the formation of cliques, clans, tribes, independent states, nations small and great, and trust combinations small and great. In society as it has hitherto existed, every separate individual, every union of individuals, and every confederation of unions, constitutes a unit. Every state or nation, or confederation of states or nations, constitutes a political unit; and every political unit is against every other political unit. Likewise, in the industrial field, every unorganized individual, every union, society, club, guild, partnership, syndicate, corporation, trust combination, every organization or confederation of organizations of either capitalists or laborers, constitutes an industrial unit, and every industrial unit is against every other industrial unit. Life as we view it to-day is a continual scene of warring, jarring, jostling and struggling. Socialism proposes to harmonize all these discordant elements, beginning with the confederation of all the industrial elements of each nation under one common, equal interest. This done in all

the great nations, the international confederation, or internationalizing process, will be easy.

But where does Socialism begin? is the question we started out to answer. It is obvious that where competition ends, co-operation begins; i. e., with trust combination. But, of course, this is not Socialism; for though the trust partakes of the characteristics of Socialism, in that it is a co-operation, in which there is common ownership, and common management, and common distribution, and the individual enjoyment of distributed income, yet the co-operation is confined to such narrow limits, being usually a small private body, the common ownership, management and distribution is so unequal, and the injustice to those without is so great, that it is very far from being Socialism as it is commonly advocated, though it might not be far amiss to call it an abnormal, monstrous form of unequal Socialism with those outside the narrow circle retained as slaves. But Socialism as now advocated, implies a public co-operation of the whole people; an equal interest in the collectively owned capital; an equal voice in the collective management; a share in the distribution that shall be equal, nearly equal, or equal in proportion to effort, and an ample provision for the unfortunate. With this view a trust would hardly be considered even slightly Socialistic. At any rate, if there is any Socialism in the trust, it is not the kind we are looking for. The operation of the trust is a selfish use of a naturally unselfish principle, co-operation, and is the natural course pursued by men who have been educated in the selfish school of competition, and Socialism must begin with an unselfish use of this principle.

The so-called Socialistic legislation mentioned by Mr. Chamberlain, the intervention by the state and the legislative enactments and enforcements of laws providing better conditions for the working classes, is indeed Socialistic, though only slightly so. In the enactment of the laws he mentions are exhibited several of the leading features of Socialism, but in a very limited degree. These are all of them, as he says, "measures which more or less limit and control individual action." The interruption and control of individual or private action by the substitution of state, or public action, as a partially controlling force in production, is one Socialistic feature; the provisions for trades unions to have a voice in the regulation of wages, together with all provisions whereby the condition of the workers has been improved, constitutes two other features; because in these measures the state puts in a voice in the matter of distribution and does something (a very little something to be sure) toward equalizing the shares; and, lastly, we may mention as

another feature of Socialism the provisions for relieving the condition of the very poor and reducing pauperism and crime. Socialism advocates ample provision for the unfortunate, those who are defective, and, although no doubt many of this class have fair capacities and would be able under favorable conditions to support themselves, yet as society is now they must be accounted defective, unable by reason of perhaps a slight degree of weakness of body or mind, or it may be moral weakness, the result of lack of moral training or a vicious environment, but unable, nevertheless, to cope with those who are stronger in the competitive struggle for life.

Mr. Chamberlain said that the poor rate had been diminished and that crime had been reduced in both quantity and character. When I read such boasts from politicians, it reminds me of a farmers' convention where it is conclusively shown by testimony based on actual experience that it is cheaper to keep animals fat than to keep them poor; that if you feed a horse better he will do more work, and that if the animal is disposed to be vicious and dangerous his disposition may be greatly improved; and that animals that are vicious and dangerous, are generally so, largely because they are mistreated; give them plenty to eat, treat them kindly, and do not compel them to work harder than they are able to stand; and that this method is much more profitable and much safer for the masters. I appeal to the reader to say if this is not a fair illustration of nearly all the legislation that has ever yet been enacted for the benefit of the masses.

The Socialistic legislation mentioned is very far from producing Socialism. It is scarcely worthy of notice as being even slightly Socialistic; and I only mention it in order that I may be able to convey to the reader a clearer conception of just what Socialism is, and show how far short is much of the vaunted "Socialistic" social reform legislation.

Judging by my somewhat meagre information, I am inclined to think that the above illustration will hold good in some measure even in New Zealand, where more has been done for the masses than in any other country on the globe. The movement there seems to be a combination of the smaller capitalists and the working classes against the larger capitalists, the land monopolists. Before the movement began, there was great dissatisfaction among the working classes. Now the main object of government seems to be to make all classes satisfied rather than to mete out justice to all; and it seems to have been very successful in attaining its object. I draw this conclusion from points like the following, found in the report alluded to:

"The state backs up private enterprise with all the machinery at its disposal, but directly private enterprise tries to work monopolies and raise prices, private enterprise receives a hint that there are limits to the patience of the people and that if that kind of thing is persevered in the Government will become an active competitor." (p. 23.)

Here, as elsewhere, the "limits to the patience of the people" is the thing most dreaded by the industrial tyrants. The difference is, that the people of New Zealand have become sufficiently awakened to demand a larger proportion of their rights than is demanded by any other people; therefore the limit to their patience is sooner found.

On page 27, the following:

"No dispute can be considered except in trade where there are trade unions, and only where these trade unions have registered under the law. This is, first, to save the courts from being overwhelmed by a flood of petty matters, and, second, because the disputes that threaten the peace and prosperity of society came from organized, not unorganized, labor."

Here you have it. Even in New Zealand with all its advanced ethics, the government has no time to render justice to those who do not know enough to ask for it, and not even then unless the asking is done in a way that threatens the "peace and prosperity of society." In line with these items, we find on pages 261 and 262, *Historians' History of the World*, the following:

"The change was emphasized by the active intervention in politics of the trade unions. These bodies, impelled by a Socialistic movement felt throughout Australia and New Zealand, decided, in 1889 and 1890, to exert their influence in returning workmen to Parliament, and where this was impossible to secure pledges from middle class candidates. This plan was first put into execution at the general election of 1890. The number of labor members thus elected to the General Assembly was small, never more than six, and no independent labor party was formed. But the interests of labor in the Progressive, or, as it preferred to be called, the Labor Party, was considerable, and the legislative results noteworthy."

Speaking of the work of reform in New Zealand, Edward Tregear, the Provincial Secretary, in a letter recently published in this country, stated that they had but barely touched the fringe of the economic garment, and that the condition of the working people might properly be called that of well fed slaves.

The government of New Zealand is the most Socialistic of any in the world, but when we apply the testing points, we find it too far defective to be properly called Socialism. Most of the capital is in the hands of private individuals who operate it. Here are two points, the ownership and the management of the capital that are each partly capitalistic and partly Socialistic. Again in the matter of distribution, there is a mixture of the capitalistic and the Socialistic. All legal provisions relating to wages, hours of labor, industry or toil, or care of aged or infirm, which have a tendency in the direction

of equalizing income, are Socialistic; the main capitalistic feature of the distribution, consists of the profits which the capitalists receive on their investments, for they must have profits else they would retire from business. Of course, the government by increasing the wages of the workers, reducing the hours of labor, heavy taxes, etc., could reduce the profits till they would barely be but wages sufficient to induce the capitalists to remain in business and manage it or see that it is managed to the best advantage, and it may be, so far as I am informed, that this is what the New Zealand government is doing. If so, so much the better for the cause of justice. I think not, however, or there would be a greater dissatisfaction than reports indicate. The New Zealanders have begun well; but whether they will continue to advance, or choose leaders who will conspire with the capitalists behind the scenes to make the people satisfied with their present attainments, is the question. This is their danger point; and it is a danger that must always accompany social reform. A century and a quarter ago, the people of our own nation began singing a new song, beginning with the words, "We have the best government in the world." The words were true then; the song became a national air; it passed from father to son, and even now you will occasionally find a man, not always from the backwoods either, who, when you undertake to talk Socialism to him, will immediately begin to sing that song, and you are exceedingly fortunate if you are able to get in another word. The New Zealanders have begun singing the same song. The words are true of them now, but it is not by any means certain that they always will be, and they, like ourselves, may go on singing the song long after it ceases to be true.*

*Since writing the above an article was quoted in the Appeal to Reason from which we make the following extract:

"The result of the 1890 struggle banded the workers of New Zealand together, and much good work was accomplished during the subsequent two or three years. Then the old enemy—political differences—intervened. Interested parties succeeded in dividing the ranks on imaginary differences and non-essentials, and unionism at the present time exists only for the benefit of a few salaried officers. Not thirty per cent of the workers in any trade are unionists, and less than five per cent of these take any interest in the affairs of their unions. And what are the subjects discussed at these meetings? Is the objective of trade unionism ever mentioned or inculcated in the speeches of their leaders? And on election day do they march in a body as trade unionists (as they do on Labor Day) and vote as trade unionists? I'm afraid the answer to these questions must be unsatisfactory, and the fact admitted that trades unionism in New Zealand is reactionary, disorganized and almost non-existent.

"After the maritime strike, already referred to (which failed because of the want of organization), the conciliation board and arbitration court were set up. In these the exploiter and the exploited meet and mutually arrange the amount of exploitation which satisfies the rapaciousness of the former, and to which the latter will submit and still manage to exist and propagate his species! Did I not live in New Zealand I should scout the idea as without the sphere of possibility. The conciliation board and arbitration act has dealt trade unionism in New Zealand its death blow. The conditions of labor and wages paid are now decided, not by the votes of the members of the unions, but by an outside tribunal, two-thirds of the members of which are in no way under the control of the unions. From its very constitution what could the workers expect but that the interests of their employers would be first and paramount

Professor Ely's program of social reform suggests much that is similar to what is being done in New Zealand, but he goes one better and advocates that, "No one who is personally qualified to render service shall enjoy an income without personal exertion." His program also includes government ownership of monopolies. It is sometimes said that if the government would take up the ownership of all the industries as fast as they became monopolies, we would soon have Socialism; for that even farming will soon become a monopoly. It would be difficult to say just how defective a system might be in Socialistic points, and still be properly termed Socialism, but a government ownership of all industries might be so managed that, to say the least of it, it would be a very imperfect Socialism. There might be a great inequality in the distribution, but in a democratic country where the people have an equal voice, the tendency would be toward improvement in this respect.

There are four classes of people who advocate social reform: First, those Socialists who favor social reform as a step to Socialism; second, sincere, conservative minded people who have the welfare of the masses at heart but fear to cut loose from the present order; third, the middle sized or smaller capitalists and those who hope to be but fear being swallowed by the great capitalists, who desire more than their just share in the distribution of wealth, while not willing to bear their share of the burden in productive effort, and who seek to offset the present movement toward Socialism by introducing a social reform that shall protect all against the great capitalists and so improve the condition of the masses, that the people will be satisfied, while they themselves may retain or accumulate their small fortunes, and thus be able to live free of toil; fourth, fake politicians who seek to ride into power on a popular wave, sell themselves to the capitalists, and conspire with them against the people.

Social reform, as we have found, proposes a combination of capitalistic with Socialistic principles, or, in other words, it is the tacking on of Socialistic principles to the capitalistic system.

To a genuine Socialist, one who comprehends the Socialist ideal in all its fullness, a program of social reform such as Professor Ely's, or any other that may be presented, seems a very foolish and difficult method of doing

every time. The workers have been robbed of their fighting weapon, the strike. The enthusiasm of the members of the unions has been killed, and all interest in trades unionism has gone by the board. The union meeting is a place for transacting routine business only, instead of a rendezvous of the advanced guard of progress and a school of preparation for the great coming event—the Social Revolution."—Philip Joseph in "The Socialist" of New Zealand.

a good thing; a method in which the adverse, reactionary forces are liable at any time to get an advantage and turn a good thing into a very poor, if not a really bad thing. He asks if we may not keep what is good in our present system and escape some of its evils. In this, it seems to me, the learned professor betrays one of two things; either an attachment for the flesh pots of Egypt, (capitalism), that is unworthy of a reformer, or a failure to grasp the full meaning of Socialism; for surely if he had studied the economies of Socialism, one branch of which is its almost entire freedom from corruption, by reason of the removal of temptations to dishonesty, as well as economy in the use of all productive forces,—if he had studied these carefully, he surely would not have turned hastily from Socialism as a thing impracticable, to proceed in the formulation of a program which must greatly multiply temptations to corruption, and which, if effective even in a small degree, must involve intricacy, where Socialism would furnish simplicity. In short, social reform is a bungling, wasteful method of doing a small part of the good that Socialism proposes to do by a systematic, scientific, economical method.

So long as private ownership is allowed to exist at all, it will continue to corrupt the administration and tap public ownership in the dark places.

Social reform, where it is of sufficient consequence to be worthy of notice, like that in New Zealand, for instance, whatever its promoters may choose to call it or intend to make of it, is but a partial Socialism, an initial stage of Socialism, hardly worthy the name, yet as a system of reform where the people are greatly benefited it is Socialism, and not capitalism, that benefits; for all the beneficial features are Socialistic. As we have already observed, there are four classes who are advocating social reform. Among these are the smaller capitalists. The position of this class is a peculiar one: they are in a dilemma from which it will require their utmost shrewdness to extricate themselves. I do not know that I can better illustrate their position and methods than by a story something like the following:

There was once a hawk that very shrewdly managed to steal from a farmer a plentiful supply of chickens for himself and his family, till all grew plump and sleek. The farmer frequently saw them sailing about very proudly, but never suspected them. There did not seem to be as many chickens as there ought to be but he did not think much about it. By and by an eagle brought his family into the vicinity. He looked about him, watched his opportunity, and pouncing down upon the hawk relieved him of his prey. The hawk did not

mind this very much but sailed away and got another chicken for his family. The eagle, becoming more familiar with the ground, repeated his performance of robbing the hawk; time and time again he repeated it and more and more frequently until the eagle family grew to an enormous size, and the wonder was how big they might finally grow to be. The hawk did not exactly fancy the treatment accorded him by the eagle, but he did not care so very much; for chickens were plentiful and easy to get, he understood his business so well. He was able to support his family about as before and managed to keep up appearances very well, so that the young hawklets were sometimes admitted into the society of the young eaglets, greatly to the delight of the former.

This state of things continued for some time, until finally, one day in a conversation with the farmer, with whom he was on the best of terms, the latter remarked that he very much feared he would have to go out of the chicken business; that somehow chickens did not pay. He did not know why, but that somehow he could not raise many chickens.

This showed the hawk that he was in a very serious dilemma. How to extricate himself now became the great question of his life. After a little reflection he decided that there was just one course for him to pursue. He would go to the eagle and tell him plainly that if he did not compromise and leave a larger share of the chickens, he would at once inform on him, and if the eagle agreed to his terms, well and good; but if not, that he would immediately put his threat into execution.

There are two sequels to this story. One is that the eagle scorned his proposition and would not deign to look at the hawk, whereupon the latter told the farmer that he had discovered why he succeeded so poorly in the chicken business; that a thorough investigation had revealed the fact that the eagle had stolen nearly all his chickens, and not only so, but that he had also stolen many of the hawk's chickens; that then the farmer flew into a rage, and procuring his gun went forthwith and broke up the eagle's nest, killing most of them and scaring the rest out of the country; that after this the hawks fared sumptuously, while the farmer was at the same time permitted to raise so many more chickens that he was ever afterward exceedingly grateful to the hawk for having helped him to break up the den of thieves, and thus save his business from ruin. The other sequel is, that after some altercation, the eagle, seeing the hawk had the drop on him, made terms at once, though with great reluctance, and that thereafter the hawk family were taken into the best society, fared the same as the other great birds, and, in fact, in a very few

years it came to be that one could hardly distinguish the hawks from the eagles so much alike had they grown to be, the eagles becoming somewhat smaller and the hawks somewhat larger. Through the influence of Mr. Eagle a number of farmers had been induced to settle in the neighborhood and embark in the chicken business, and chicken became an important feature of all the fetes, dinners, pie socials, etc., of the hawk-eagle society.

It is amusing to see the smaller capitalists squirm. For a dozen years or more they have been sitting in silence, and now they are out with a program. But the most curious thing that has ever happened in man's history since Adam lost one of his ribs, is that after they have ransacked the earth, gone through all the philosophy of the past, and, no doubt, given flight to the wings of their imagination in all possible directions, the best they can do, the only safe thing, is to adopt a Socialistic program—the very thing they most fear except capitalism—and it isn't safe from their point of view. They know that only too well. They realize fully that they are playing with fire, but it must be done. They know that it is the only chance for them and that it is but a forlorn hope. They have learned that there is nothing between the big end of capitalism, the trust, and Socialism. They like the trust, if only they might be admitted to the inner circle and permitted to take rooms at No. 26 Broadway, but they realize that such a privilege is only for the very select few, and they also realize that to be left out is death, unless they can form a powerful coalition that will destroy the inner circle, the eagle's nest, and they find there is no possible means of doing this except by Socialistic methods. What they want is to introduce just enough Socialism to enable them to accomplish their purpose and then fossilize Socialism in its initial stages, but they tremble at the fear that by that time the people may become so widely awakened that they will not let it fossilize. But as they always have succeeded in hoodwinking the people, they hope still to be able to manage them somehow.

There is no knowing just how many will be found playing the hawk. Probably the number will be comparatively small that do this intentionally and with a full understanding of the import of their actions; but it is greatly to be feared that the number connected with the hawk family will be by far too large for the best interests of society. While I realize that we should avoid being over suspicious, I cannot but think that there is a great danger along this line, and that no matter whether Socialism be started with an intention of making it a full fledged Socialism, or simply a mere system

of social reform, there will be a strong effort made on the part of some to fossilize the system; to make the people believe they have reached the summum bonum in government; to persuade them that they would better leave well enough alone, and to induce them to take up the old cry, "We have the best government in the world." As compared with Socialism, social reform is a failure as a scheme of distributive justice, because it furnishes an opportunity to avoid the full distributive justice which Socialism proposes; and we find also that whatever improvement is furnished by social reform over our present system is due to the Socialism there is in it, and that whatever it lacks of justice is the result of what it lacks of being perfect Socialism.

To make this plainer, let us consider a few points in the New Zealand work. The government, by Socialistic methods, that is, by public ownership of railways, telegraphs, telephones and a few other things, its intervention in the partial control of private industries and its system of agencies, stimulated industry throughout the country and brought prosperity to nearly, if not entirely all classes. By intervention in behalf of the wage earners, part of the injustice to them is avoided; but by reason of the capitalism that is mixed up in it, complete justice cannot be done; for capitalism must have profits, and these, in justice, belong to the worker.

Then take Professor Ely's program: all the measures proposed are necessarily Socialistic measures, providing partial Socialism; and since all the points of social reform by which it is capable of working an improvement over our present order, in other words since all the good points in social reform are Socialistic points, therefore all the good wrought by social reform is so much done by Socialism, and this goes toward establishing the proposition that nothing else but Socialism is practicable; for capitalism fails utterly and since there is no other system proposed, the nearest being anarchism which is conspicuous mainly for its absence of system, therefore Socialism is a necessity and the only question is as to which is more practicable, Socialism in full or partial Socialism, that is, Socialism or social reform.

"It has so happened in all ages of the world that some have labored, and others have, without labor, enjoyed a large proportion of the profits. This is wrong and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any good government."—Abraham Lincoln, *Comp. Works*, Vol. 1, p. 92.

CHAPTER IX.

THE PRACTICABILITY OF SOCIALISM.

"And I believe it to be entirely practicable, in fact that any other system is simply barbarous."—Frances E. Willard.

Who has not often heard that Socialism is impracticable? On every hand we hear people say, "Oh, that sounds nice enough but you can never make it work." Ask the politician for the main argument against Socialism and the answer comes back gruffly to you as it has to me "Socialism isn't practicable." The first question that meets us in the discussion of this topic is, what does it take to constitute a thing practicable? Of course, we know that practicability means that which may be practiced; but that does not meet the case. What we want is a practical definition of practicable, one that can be practically applied to the matter in hand.

In discussing the practicability of Socialism as a system of society we should not confine ourselves to the simple question as to whether under Socialism people will be able to live till they die. If this were all, any system, even savagery is practicable. But the practical question which confronts us is, how successful is it reasonable to expect that Socialism will be, both in its initial stages and in its later development, as a means for the promotion of human welfare? And not simply this, but how successful as compared with other systems, especially such others as the people may be disposed to adhere to. Its success as a general scheme of justice and benevolence; the feasibility and adaptability of its methods; both in acquiring possession and in its operation in all departments of human activity—these all have a bearing in determining its practicability. If Socialism were decidedly unjust it would seriously mar its practicability; while, on the other hand, its thorough justification goes far toward establishing its practicability. Similarly we may say of the necessity of Socialism that if it can be shown that all other systems fail absolutely as methods of promoting human welfare, then we are left to cling to Socialism as our only hope, even though the prospect of making it a success may be so poor as to render it but a forlorn hope. (But we will find that it is not a forlorn hope.) And again, if there were no possible way for the people to acquire possession of the industries, the practicability of Socialism would be a mere dream.

In considering the practicability of Socialism I shall endeavor to furnish a somewhat detailed explanation of its practical workings, and occasionally to hold up before the reader a word picture of Socialism in action.

In undertaking to do this I cannot but realize that I am handicapped very seriously by the fact that no one can tell positively at the present stage of the game, just what the actual program of Socialism will be. That will depend on what the majority say; but since the people demand a feasible practicable program before taking so decisive a step, it becomes a matter of the greatest importance. And yet if we understand thoroughly the Socialist philosophy it may not after all, be so very difficult to determine approximately what will be the fruits that result from the germination of its great seed thoughts planted in the minds of the people.

The subjects of the next succeeding ten chapters all relate to the practicability of Socialism, and if we would understand it thoroughly, we must consider them patiently in all their bearings and details. It is an extensive subject, but it is very important. Perhaps there is not another question that is now calling forth the best thought of the civilized world to such an extent as this question, "Is Socialism practicable?" The ideals of Socialism are admired the world over. All honest people who think closely on the subject admit the justice of Socialism; but when they come to the practicability they stand dazed and confused at what appears to them to be a tangled labyrinth of matter surrounding the subject. Questions! questions! questions! cross each other at every step; objections spring up from behind every bush. After a little desultory superficial skirmishing they retire shaking their heads; and I am astonished to know that among them are found men of brains, men renowned for their learning and erudition. But need there be any doubt? I think not, if we will but have the patience to wade boldly in, dig to bed rock at every important point and let our motto be "One thing at a time." Never mind the criss-cross questions and objections at first. These will mostly vanish of their own accord as we proceed with our investigation.

CHAPTER X.

THE JUSTICE AND BENEVOLENCE OF SOCIALISM.

There seems to exist in the minds of many good people, the idea that Socialism proposes a great injustice to the present property owners. Some who admire the high ideals of Socialism and are favorably disposed to it in other respects, stumble at the proposition to usher in the new system by what seems to them to be virtually a wholesale robbery. Let me assure the reader however, at the outset, that

there could scarcely be anything farther from the truth; and to show that I am in good company in this position, I cite you to the extract already quoted from Miss Willard's speech in which she denounced the great inequalities of distribution. I also call your attention to the fact that Professor Ely with all his doubtings concerning the practicability of Socialism, says confidently, that "Socialism is strong on its moral and ethical side;" that one of its strong points is its distributive justice; and that "Socialism is not a scheme of criminals for theft and robbery;" that the criminal only looks out for to-day, while Socialism plans for the future upbuilding of the human race. A careful study of this topic will reveal the fact that the failure of many to appreciate the justice of Socialism, is the result of distorted ideals of justice which competition and capitalism have set before the world. By means of all the institutions of society, our ideas of the rights of property and the sacredness of those rights, have been so thoroughly riveted upon the minds of the people that they seem like bed rock, fundamental, as some one has said, "so because it is so and that is all there is to it." There is perhaps, no other principle the inculcation of which has done more to educate the public conscience than that of the sacredness of the rights of property; and I am very glad indeed that the public conscience has been so educated; for it is to that conscience that I now appeal. One of the chief tests of the civilization of a people in the past has been their respect for the rights of property; and when the world comes to understand better just what those rights are, the same test will determine whether or not we are rising still higher in the scale of civilization.

Let any reader who is in doubt about the justice of Socialism, turn back and reread Chapters II., III. and V., reflect carefully and say if you think the moral title to the bulk of the wealth is where the legal title places it. If not, then there is an injustice done those who have a moral right but are kept out of possession. Socialism proposes the collective ownership of most of the property; of all of what is called capital or tools of production, that is, the land with its improvements, excepting what is used for homes; (and even these no doubt many will find it more convenient to rent from the government because of the changing wants of their families and the necessity or disposition to change localities,) all live stock excepting such as are used privately, as, for instance, a cow or driving horse, which probably very few will care to be bothered with, as the state could supply the needs of each much cheaper; all the facilities for travel, com-

munication and transportation, and whatever property may be necessary in providing for the general welfare.

As we have seen, the average of wealth per family is about \$6,000.00, and it is evident that it does not matter whether one own and operate his share separately, or share in the collective ownership, provided he derives the same benefit with the same effort. Now, it is clear, must be clear to any thinking person, that in such case Socialism would not be unjust, if, after the transfer of the wealth from private to public ownership, allowing an equal share to each one, the amount of wealth then held unjustly, is not greater than the amount now held unjustly; for, be it remembered, that to say the least of it, there is a very great injustice being perpetrated now, in that a very great part of the wealth is now legally owned by those who have no moral right to it, and Socialism cannot be unjust in making such transfer, unless it increases the injustice.

And when the reader has studied the various economies of Socialism, and considered the greater certainty which it will provide instead of the financial uncertainty that now exists, and also the greatly improved advantages which the higher society of Socialism will furnish, he will then be able to see that one now having several times that amount would be financially benefited by exchanging it for a six thousand dollar interest in the co-operative commonwealth. It follows then, if this be true, that no injustice could result from a Socialistic transfer unless the amount held unjustly then, should be several times greater than that held unjustly now, which is not the case; for it may easily be shown that instead of being several times greater, it would be several times less.

I believe there is much more good in human nature than it usually gets credit for. Many who adhere to the principles of our present order revolt against some of their legitimate results. For instance, they endorse in a general way the agreed price as a just basis of exchange, yet frequently, when the price is extremely high or extremely low, will denounce it as robbery. Again they endorse what they call "vested rights," the right of each one to do as he pleases with his own; yet when he takes advantage of his fellow-man's necessities and exacts an exorbitant interest, or rent, or profit, again they cry robbery! and raise the standard of revolt against the principles they endorse. I am very glad there are so many who are better than their principles. It gives room to hope that they may be led to see the defects in those principles, and induced to throw them away and substitute those that are better. And they are doing this even now. Like an old coat, the people have out-

grown their principles; and it is gratifying to know that every day they are doffing the old and donning the new that fit them better. But with the ideals of justice held by those who are still wearing their outgrown principles it is evident that a very large part of the wealth is held unjustly, especially the great fortunes which are very largely the accumulations resulting not merely from exorbitant rent, interest and profit, but also the results of political corruption, trust combination, conspiracies, etc. Socialism proposes the use of machinery on a large scale, such as is not dreamed of under capitalism; of much better organization, much more systematic, scientific and economical methods of production and distribution, and that all who are able shall help. Socialists hope that by the economic use of all the productive forces that are now working principally at cross purposes, the production may be easily doubled with a considerable reduction in the effort required by each one, and that by the use of machinery on a vast scale as well as by more systematic, scientific and economical methods, it may at least be doubled and more likely quadrupled again.

Socialism proposes to supply all man's wants. If it proves to be practicable as we Socialists have full confidence it will, even to within half or a fourth of our expectations, the lot of each one will be more enjoyable than that of any millionaire now. The possession of great wealth brings a burden of care which would be unknown under Socialism; for if Socialism can be made to work at all at the start, it can be improved so that one having tasted its sweets would not exchange his common lot for all the wealth of a Rockefeller. But this treatment of the subject is based on the ideals of those who are still wearing the old coat, the old principles, the extreme results of which they revolt against, the principle of mutual agreement in questions of wages, of price, rent, interest and profit, and the principle of "vested rights," all of which boiled down signify simply that "might makes right." And just here a few words on vested rights. In the days of slavery the slave-owner talked much of these; but in reply it was said, that, admitting the validity of the principle, these so-called "vested rights" are rights only by sufferance of the law, and that being morally wrong they cannot possibly continue any moral right after the law has terminated the right by sufferance. So with capitalism. In its last analysis capitalism is but a form of slavery. Wealth or property, especially property in capital, the tools of production, is desirable for the power that it gives over men. The chattel slave owner desired the ownership of slaves in order that he might command their services. That is exactly why the capitalist

desires the ownership of capital, that he may command the services of the wage slave. The more capital he has the more services he may command. Capitalism too is in itself morally wrong, and the "vested rights" under it are also merely rights by sufferance, and can have no morally binding force beyond the time when the people abolish them with the system from which they sprang and substitute something better. Accumulations of wealth, especially great wealth, are largely the result of chance. The owner justifies himself on the ground of the risk he has taken. To this we reply, very well; the risk is worth something though generally less than the profits, else the fortunes would not exist; but however that may be, no just claim by virtue of risk can possibly extend beyond the close of the competitive system under which all business is to a greater or less extent gambling, when Socialism will put an end to the gambling and substitute certainty for uncertainty. So much then for the treatment of the subject on this lower plane. And now, you who are still clinging to the old principles, the extreme effects of which you revolt against, you who are still wearing or trying to wear the old coat, let me implore you to throw away the little old, ragged, dirty, blood-stained thing, and come, follow me, while I show you a beautiful garment, and spotlessly clean, a little large for you just now, it may be, but if you eat plenty of the right kind of food, you may soon grow till it will fit you to a "T." Come let us examine these new principles, which are not entirely new, for they have been recognized by many philosophers and sages of the past, but they are practically new to most people. I refer to the three propositions already stated, namely, first, "The earth with all its resources is the common heritage of all the people;" second, "Wealth belongs to those who produce it;" and third, "Human welfare is the highest basis of right."

First, "The earth with all its resources is the natural heritage of all the people." It seems hardly necessary to offer anything in proof of this proposition beyond its simple statement, its truthfulness is so self-evident. Nevertheless, I will occupy a short space in endeavoring to elucidate it somewhat.

Whether you are Christian or non-Christian, you believe that the earth exists for the benefit of all and not simply for a few. That naturally all the people have an equal right to all earth's resources must be admitted by all excepting those who adhere to the principle that "might makes right," and I have no words to waste upon those who adopt so brutal a standard: at least it is not worth while trying to convince such of the justice of Socialism. The only thing that we may be able to do with them now is, to show them that Socialism

is to their individual interest, failing in which, we hope in due time to prove in a practical way by their own standard, the justice of Socialism.

There is an old saying that "he takes my house who takes away the prop by which my house doth stand." Applying the principle of this maxim to the matter in hand, we may say, as someone has said, "He takes my life who takes away the means by which I live." Man must have air, water, and a supply of the earth's products for food, clothing and shelter, or he will die; and unless he is supplied with books, papers, pictures, schools, laboratories, libraries, sermons, lectures, leisure, etc., etc., in short, unless he has opportunity for the development of his higher nature, which he cannot have without access to earth's resources, about all is lost that makes life worth living. We would think it "just awful" if a syndicate should contaminate the air of a city so as to cause the death of all those who breathe it and then charge so much for the privilege of breathing pure air from without which it brings through pipes, that it would take all the wages of a working man to pay it. "What!" we would say, "must we choose between slavery and death?" Again, suppose the water supply of our cities, now furnished for a small sum, should be placed at an equally exorbitant figure; and again we would say, "What! must we choose between slavery and death?" And again; suppose the earth should fall into the hands of a few persons who should cut the people off from using its resources and charge so much for its products that the masses of the people could barely supply themselves with the coarsest kinds of food, clothing and shelter, with little or no time or opportunity for education and culture. And again we would say, "What! must we choose between slav—" "Oh, that is all right," someone breaks in, "it always has been so and always will be. It is according to the laws of nature for the strong to prey upon the weak. It is the universal law of all animal life and man is no exception; it is nature, therefore, it is right." If there is anything to prove conclusively that man has risen from the brute, it is the reflection that if such a man with such brutish ideals should fall back to the brute plane, the distance of the fall would be so short that it would scarcely jar him. Yes, it is quite true that it always has been so that a very large part of the people must choose between slavery and death; but it does not necessarily follow that it always will be so. It is only by means of laws that one can enjoy the separate ownership and use of land. No law nor set of laws whereby a few acquire possession of the land and its resources, which enables them to enslave their fellow men, is right unless such slavery is

necessary to the advancement of civilization, and such laws cannot confer any moral right extending beyond the period covered by such necessity. Legislation has, no doubt, often been enacted concerning land ownership which was beneficial to the people at the time and for a considerable period afterward, but later, became very detrimental to the welfare of another generation. In such case the former generation has no right to bind the latter, and no law by the former, the effect of which is to put the latter out of possession, can make it wrong for the latter to enact a law or laws restoring the possession to themselves. Our time-honored customs and laws of inheritance whereby property of every kind passes at the death of the owner to the next of kin, seem like bed rock. It has come to seem almost sacrilegious to interrupt them. But why should it? It is true that the parent is the natural guardian of the child during minority, and that the family brotherhood constitutes, to some extent, an insurance company, providing partly by tacit understanding based on custom, and partly by the ties of nature, for the support of such of its members as are unfortunate. But really, after such guardianship and insurance has been provided for by the state, as Socialism proposes to do, why should the state be under obligation to confer upon a person property which he never earned and which comes from a parent who owes him nothing but to whom he is greatly indebted, especially if such ownership militates against the welfare of society in general? To be sure, there is that doubtful point, the desire of the owner that his offspring or next of kin shall inherit. But, to say the most of it, it is not worthy of even a passing consideration when dealing with the important matter of restoring to the people their natural rights. Again, one cannot accumulate wealth, especially great wealth, outside of society. He is therefore largely indebted to society for it, and society is justly entitled to a greater share in the distribution than those who owe him nothing. The owners of wealth are not only indebted to society for much of it, but it is chiefly its connection with society that renders it valuable. Rockefeller's wealth would be greatly depreciated if it were suddenly transferred to the regions occupied by the wild tribes of the Sudan, saying nothing of the fact that he could never have accumulated such a fortune there.

Looking at the matter as we will from anything like a reasonable standpoint our first proposition is true: the land with all its natural resources is the natural heritage of all the people; and nothing can justly keep them out of possession, unless we admit that the necessities of civilization demand the slavery which its concentrated private ownership

imposes, and which necessity, of course must end when something better is provided to take its place. So far as their right to the earth and its natural resources is concerned, each generation comes into the world with the same rights as every other generation.

Second, "Wealth justly belongs to those who produce it." Obviously, this proposition is a direct corollary of the first and must stand or fall with it; and if, as we think, the first is established beyond question, there can be no doubt about the second. And as sure as this is true, just so sure is it true that the great bulk of aggregated wealth belongs to the great mass of working people from whom it was drawn. In applying this principle under Socialism it is proposed to regard as producers all those who aid in the production and distribution, all who, by either mental or physical effort in any way minister to the wants of man. Socialism also proposes to modify this proposition in relation to the disabled, those who are prenatally defective in either body or mind and those incapacitated for any productive effort by reason of mental or bodily infirmity resulting from disease, accident or old age. Socialism proposes to put the whole body politic upon the plane of a great insurance company, so that the contributions of society to the disabled may be considered, not as a charitable gift to them, but as their right, their insurance, and by that means, protect them from the humiliation of being regarded as the pitiful objects of charity, as in our present society. There is a humiliation in stretching forth the hand for assistance as an object of charity which inflicts a degree of suffering that is unbearable, and it is the manifest duty of society to provide if practicable against this suffering, which could be easily done under a Socialist administration.

But there is another reason that comes in back of this. Leaving out the question as to whether wealth should pass by individual inheritance, let us consider that a large part of the value attached to all wealth comes from the fact of its being in society, and that whatever part that is, society has a just claim on it to that extent and should inherit accordingly; and, that whether society as a whole receives it or not, if it is justly entitled to it, then the next generation has a just right to it by inheritance from the former generation, and that the unfortunate justly inherit their equal right not only to the earth and its natural resources and to the publicly owned product, but also to their part of the private surplus which the public should but does not receive. But, after all, such inheritance does not alter their dependence excepting to divide it between the past and present generations. But, we ask, what has been done for the unfortunate?

Nothing, practically nothing. The only thing that I have heard of worthy of note is the old age pension of New Zealand, of 25 cents per day to all native born mendicant citizens over sixty-five years of age. (and I believe there is also a similar provision in Australia.) And this measure has been blazed around the world as a wonderfully magnificent example of state benevolence. Many are the heads that have shaken in doubt of the wisdom of such a venture. Even under our present industrial system the governments of the earth could adopt this principle, but unfortunately, nearly all so far have been conducted in the interest of the wealthy classes who do not take to the idea. Capitalism is not built that way. As to providing for the general welfare, capitalism is a signal failure, and is therefore impracticable. But what of Socialism? Socialism proposes to do this very identical thing; and it would succeed far better than capitalism could if it tried; for Socialism would rid society of that industrial oppression that stultifies manhood and causes some to feign misfortune. Socialism proposes to apply this insurance idea to its fullest extent, which it could easily do, while capitalism opposes it and could not so easily do it if it would. If capitalism should attempt it, there would be unavoidably more or less corruption, while under Socialism there would be practically no reason for corruption. And I see no reason why the people should not desire the continuance of the measure. On this point then, the providing for the welfare of the unfortunate, Socialism is perfectly practicable.

Third, "Human welfare is the highest basis of right." Here is the highest principle of all. It is the unselfish, the brotherhood principle. It is the principle which recognizes the fact and acts on the recognition, that "the life and happiness of others is just as valuable as mine." The principles of justice are high principles, but that of brotherhood is higher; and notwithstanding the fact that so far, practically all industrial and most political action has been based on the lower, selfish principles, yet in our present society this brotherhood principle is recognized in various ways. The theoretical motto of all democracies, "the greatest good to the greatest number," is one form of expression for this principle. In time of war all nations recognize it when they call for men to offer their lives a sacrifice for the general welfare, and those who respond recognize it by their action in doing so, and this latter is the encouraging feature of it. It proves it to be a living, acting, moving force, this principle of brotherhood. The history of the past shows that all along it has been a very potent force under certain conditions; that it is naturally strong; that though continually smothered and

trampled into the dust in the competitive struggle, it has remained so strong that it could nearly always be relied on in time of war or great public danger. Experience also shows that the higher the civilization the stronger the manifestation of brotherhood has been. This is another very encouraging feature. Socialism proposes to use this principle for all it is worth; and, discarding competition with all its baleful influences, to second and cultivate the brotherhood principle by a brotherly co-operation in production and adherence to justice in distribution. If the principle of brotherhood has remained even but half alive during the past, what might it not accomplish in so radically improved an environment? Pessimistic indeed must be the student of Socialism who can see nothing in this to inspire hope.

We have reached a point in civilization where we must either take a step forward, or we must fall backward. The people are preparing to step forward, and the capitalists, through the press, the politicians, etc., are laying snares to trip them at the first step. We have come to the point where there is a great emergency. We have discovered that we are a nation of slaves. Many millions are crying aloud under the lash of rigorous and cruel taskmasters. Misery and want stalk abroad at noonday and are found in the very shadow of the greatest piles of wealth the world has ever known. From the factory, mine and tenement house, from every quarter where abides a son of toil, comes the sad wail of despair, accompanied by the cry, "Let us have a change and let there be no unnecessary delay." A perfectly practicable way out of our bondage has been discovered. It may no longer be said that slavery in some form is necessary in order that the wheels of progress may continue to roll, for a perfectly feasible method has been devised whereby the work of civilization may be pushed happily forward by the more than willing hands of freemen. The plan of a system has been proposed, under which all poverty will cease, together with all the misery, squalor, degradation and crime that goes with it. The first step in the introduction of this system is the acquisition of all our industries which are now in the possession of private persons. And here the enemy gets in his first work. The present owners of wealth ask arrogantly, "How are you going to get possession? And then the weak ones repeat meekly after them, "Yes, sure enough, how are we going to get possession?" This is one of the snares by which they seek to cause the people to stumble and fall back. When there is a great national emergency, that is to say, when there is something that these autocrats want which must be purchased with blood, then they, through the government which

they own, declare that there is a great emergency and call upon the people to volunteer, and if they do not respond in sufficient numbers, then they compel them to go forth to the slaughter and sacrifice their lives for the "general welfare." Now, we have a greater emergency than ever confronted any nation in all the history of the past. Now the people are calling upon the **masters** to make a sacrifice. Do they respond? Yes, with sneers and jeers and taunts. They are not asked to risk their lives; only to contribute their wealth that a whole nation may be made happy. And there is every reason to believe that they themselves would see far more enjoyment in life than they now do. Even if they are justly entitled to all their wealth, they ought to be willing to do this. Why not? Is wealth more sacred than human welfare? But they are not justly entitled to it. By every rule having even the semblance of justice they are cut off. Even by the lower ideals of justice heretofore held by the people their claim cannot stand, and when we apply those higher principles contained in the three foregoing propositions their claims melt like snow before a summer's sun. The land with its resources is the people's by natural indefeasible right. The capital and all forms of wealth is theirs because they produced it. Lastly, their welfare, the general welfare, the highest basis of right demands it, demands its own.

CHAPTER XI.

ACQUIRING POSSESSION.

Since the methods of acquiring possession of the industries, as well as the methods of operating them, must be determined by the will of the majority at the time Socialism is inaugurated, we Socialists, who are now largely in the minority, cannot say accurately and positively just what those methods will be. We, who are now Socialists, may agree as to what **we** consider the best methods only to see them set aside and others substituted by those who join our movement later. But since people require first to be shown the practicability of Socialism, it is necessary to devote considerable space to the Socialistic program, and it is quite possible that the majority may see their way clear to proceed with a program that is somewhat inferior before they could be induced to adopt what is really the best; and this point should not be overlooked, for it does not matter so much how Socialism starts, so it begins with a set of methods that prove to be practicable.

How are we to get possession? is generally one of the first questions that pops up before the mind of the student of Socialism. Someone has said that the best way to do a thing is to do it. For many years prior to our great civil strife, the great question that agitated the nation was how to free the negro. Finally, the question was settled by simply setting him free. So it will be in the matter of getting possession of our industries. When the time comes, the people will settle it by taking possession. I was about to say, by **simply** taking possession, but there is the question to be decided, whether it shall be directly or indirectly, suddenly or gradually; as to the question of **taking** possession there can be no doubt. If we ever get possession, we must **take** possession. There is a little tract entitled, "Methods of Acquiring Possession of our National Industries," by N. A. Richardson, which it would be well for those who are not clear on this subject to procure and read; for they will find it more elaborately treated there than we have space for here. The author names four methods: 1. Confiscation; 2. Competition; 3. Purchase; 4. Pension. To acquire possession by the first of these methods would be **simply** taking possession, or taking possession directly. The second is somewhat indirect and complex. In this it is proposed that the government become a competitor, build rival establishments to compete with those privately owned, operate them in the interest of the people, that is to say, at cost, eliminating all profits, and, by competition also eliminating all profits from the privately owned plants, so that their owners, seeing they had become worthless to themselves, would be ready to turn them over to the government for a mere nominal sum. According to our present day methods of doing business and our present standards of honor, this method would be perfectly legitimate and honorable. Of course the owners of the private plants would clamor for a recompense, but measured by our present standards, none would be due, any more than to the vanquished where a great corporation organized by the capitalists, crushes all its little antagonists. It would be a case of the people beating the capitalists at their own game, and the latter should stand pat and not squeal. Nevertheless, it would be but confiscation under another name. The fourth method mentioned is for the government to take the property and compensate the great capitalists in part by granting them pensions which shall cease with the expiration of their natural lives, and let that end it. We readily see that this method also is but another plan of confiscation. It proposes beginning with a direct, partial confiscation, which is to become complete a little further on.

But there is still another method. We have reserved it until the last because it is the popular method. By many it is called **the** method, and by considerable numbers who have very little comprehension of the situation it is called the only **honest** method. I refer to the third method treated by Comrade Richardson, the purchase method. Many, even those who have devoted some attention to the study of the justice of Socialism and the injustice of capitalism regard this as the very best method, the cheapest, the safest, the "peaceable method." "Let us," they say, "pay the holders of wealth for its full value as a matter of sound policy, even if they do not deserve it." And then they point to the fact that it would have been far cheaper from a money point of view and have saved the spilling of much precious blood, to have paid the slave owners every cent the slaves were worth and even more. This sounds nice and this is the reason it is so popular. But before considering this matter as settled let us follow this line of thought to its legitimate conclusion. I have no objection to being careful to adopt a "peaceable method;" but I am fully convinced that the safest course is for a very large part of the people to understand as thoroughly as possible the whole situation as it is. Next to vice, ignorance is the most dangerous thing in the world. Nearly all the devastating wars of the past might have been avoided if the people had not been ignorant. Just what, then, does it mean, this proposition to pay the holders of wealth every dollar their holdings are worth?

As we have already observed, that and that only which makes wealth valuable, is the power which it confers upon the holder to command the services of others. This is what made the title to the chattel slave valuable to the master, and what makes the title to all forms of property, especially that of the great capitalists, valuable to the holders now. As already mentioned, one-tenth of the people of our country own nine-tenths of the wealth. Practically speaking then, one-tenth are able to command the services of all the rest. But this is not the worst. When we consider that a very large majority of this one-tenth are lower middle class and rather small farmers and business men, whose services are commanded indirectly, but commanded just as surely, when we consider this, it becomes evident that a much smaller number, probably not over a million, are able to command practically all the services of the other eighty millions. That is precisely what the slave master did with the chattel slave. There is a little difference in the details, it is true. We eighty million white slaves have on an average, somewhat better food, clothing and shelter. (A very large proportion of the

lower strata of us have not), but nearly all of us work harder than the black slaves did, and when it comes to care and anxiety, we are nearly all under a strain to which the black slave was a total stranger. If there had been no interruption of the slave master's title, his power over the slave would have been perpetual. So also in our present case, unless there shall be some interruption of the capital master's title, his power over the eighty million **white** slaves must be perpetual

Let one million of the wealthiest people in this country league themselves together and stand loyally by each other, and they would be able to inflict upon the remaining eighty millions a bondage more galling than the black slave ever knew; and the bondage would be perpetual; no power on earth, save one, would enable them to throw it off. "And what is that one?" I imagine I hear from a great clamorous confusion of voices, Oh, never mind, it doesn't matter. "What!" you say, "eighty million people in a rigorous and perpetual bondage, you know of a way out and refuse to tell us what it is? What do you mean?" I mean simply this; that the only way under the sun by which we could extricate ourselves would be to capture the government. "Oh, that's easy," you say. Yes, that is very easy when a majority agree together to do it. What then? "Oh, to be sure, we would at once proceed to enact a system of laws that would lift the yoke from our necks." Be careful! be careful! Don't you know you are treading on dangerous ground? You are talking confiscation; for any legal interference by which you escape any part of the services previously commanded by the capitalists, depreciates the value of their holdings by that much and is to that extent a confiscation. "Confiscation or no confiscation, we will not endure a galling bondage. Confiscation is better than perpetual slavery." Yes, that is what I thought from the start, and I have taken so much pains and have occupied so much space in order to make this point plain, because I know that even among Socialists there are many who talk loudly about being enslaved, and yet do not believe the half of it; and that when they come to know and comprehend the whole situation fully, so tame a word as confiscation will have no further terrors for them. I trust I have made it plain to any thinking person who reads carefully, that no legal interruption being permitted, the value of the wealth held by the plutocratic one million at the top, can, practically speaking, only be measured by the perpetual and undivided services of the eighty millions below them, and that therefore it is utterly out of the question for them to buy their freedom. Any method by which we may dispossess the

present holders of great wealth and place it in the hands of the whole people, amounts to a confiscation; and such confiscation would be right, for it would, in reality be, on the whole, wresting the wealth from the hands of usurpers and restoring it to its rightful owners. I know that the capitalist dislikes very much the confiscation idea, and it may be that the people may adopt the competitive method, the purchase method or some other indirect method, and may, many of them, be deceived into thinking that they are avoiding confiscation, but they will not be able to deceive the capitalists. They will understand the situation perfectly and will use it for all it is worth in trying to confuse the people. My opinion is that it were better for the great mass of the people to thoroughly comprehend the whole situation and make a square open fight on the merits of the case.

At present the popular tendency is to look for some sort of gradual method of acquisition and, so far as I am able to see, such a course may possibly be the best under all the circumstances that arise when the choice is made, but, to say the least of it, several obstacles are liable to arise in applying the gradual process. In the first place, Socialism proposes a radical change and any gradual process of effecting it would necessitate to a greater or less extent the sewing of new cloth onto an old garment, by which the rent might be made worse. In the second place, any decisive step of the people looking toward the establishment of Socialism, would tend to demoralize what is left of capitalism. The capitalists might consider the whole matter as settled and many of them might cease to take much further interest, to the material lessening of production; or, in the third place, they might use the power which their remaining wealth would confer to confuse the people, make them believe that the Socialistic efforts were a failure and cause them to desire a return to the old order, to the flesh pots of capitalism.

There may be some things, possibly many things, bearing on this point, which I fail to consider, and consequently, draw a wrong conclusion, but considering the probable difficulties named above I am strongly inclined to the opinion that it would be better to make practically the whole change at one step or one leap or bound if you prefer the term. I know that many will say in answer to this—"too stupendously big a step to take all at once."

But is it, will it be? Let us consider that no decisive step can be taken till the people come to understand Socialism and the necessity for it sufficiently to make them desirous of taking the step. This educational work is part of the gradual

process work that is now moving steadily on. The other part of it is the gradual development by the trust, of the new co-operative garment, which is so shrouded by the old selfish capitalistic rag that it discovers to our view "neither beauty nor comeliness that we should desire it." But when the educational process has been completed and the tattered old garment of capitalism has been torn off or fallen by reason of its own weight and rottenness, then the new garment, having received the touches of the pure and unselfish principles of the new era, will disclose to our view a degree of youthful beauty as yet unknown to earth; not perfect beauty; perfection will require the work of time. There will probably be a very great difference between the earlier stages of Socialism and its later development. The preparatory work having been accomplished, the transition will perhaps be a mere incident, an important one to be sure, but not so important as the casting, counting and declaring of labor's finally victorious ballot. I see no reason why the people should not carry an election in November, and by March have practically all the industries organized except farming where the land is held in small tracts. It will probably be arranged for the small farmers to go on somewhat in the old way for a time, each one using what land he can cultivate himself, receiving such sum for the product as the government may adjudge to be just, and this for three reasons: First, it will probably require some little time to arrange for the most successful application of the new methods of agriculture which will come in under Socialism. Second, the small farms, being cut up into small fields, small pastures, small orchards, etc., will not yield so readily to the application of large scale methods. Third, the small farmer will be the last to desire an exchange of private enterprise for a position in the public service. The larger farmers will not care to keep their farms, because the government, as the principal employer of labor, will set the example of giving the laborer the full product of his toil; the farmer will be compelled to do the same, and rather than do this or take just what he can work alone, he will generally prefer to take a position in the government service where more profitable methods can be applied. From this class will probably come the first corps of public farm managers, overseers and foremen. Later, each young man will receive thorough special training for the particular kind of work he expects to do. By the time the government gets ready to operate the small farms, the small farmers will be very glad to give up their private holdings and take the much better paying positions in the government service.

And again we pause to ask, why should not labor take

possession of its own, which it has purchased over and over by many generations of slavery?

And now while writing this come the papers with the announcement of President Roosevelt's "Muck Rake speech," in which he proposes to lop off a slice from all vast fortunes by a progressive tax on all inheritances beyond a certain amount. This is followed by Ex-Senator Turner's advocacy of the calling of a national convention for the purpose of revising and amending our constitution. Also, through a religious paper, comes the following, the writer referred to being unknown to me:

"Comment has been made again upon the power of judicial authority as against the legislative, in instances where the constitutionality of laws is to be passed upon. A case is cited in which seven judges, if the decision was unanimous, overruled the authority of the Governor and 120 legislators, which was supported by ninety-nine-hundredths of a suffering public. The remedy proposed in the following paragraph may or may not be the best, but if its closing statement is true, some sort of remedy is imperatively demanded.

"There is an increasing number of people who firmly believe that the best thing which the people of the United States, and of the several States, could do, is to abrogate every word of our much-vaunted constitutions, except the clauses constituting the governments, and let each generation enact such laws as it deems best to meet conditions as they exist, as is done in Canada, Great Britain and most other countries, and every such decision as that of our Supreme Court in the cases referred to makes converts to that doctrine. The 'Constitution' is invoked twenty times to sustain a fraud, perpetuate an abuse or enable some criminal to escape the fangs of the law for once that it is used in the interests of the public."

Since these all fit into our subject at this point, we will pause and consider them. And I must say that it is a source of no little gratification to me, while advocating the principle of confiscation, which I realize must call forth upon my head the anathemas of capitalism, to find myself in such distinguished company; for what is the lopping off of big chunks from great fortunes by providing that no one shall inherit beyond a certain amount, but a confiscation of the chunk cut off? What is any income tax, graduated or simple; and, for that matter, what is any tax, but a confiscation? Once admit the principle of taking private property for public use, as we do in all current forms of taxation, and where is it to end? What is the limit of taxation beyond which it would be wrong to proceed further? To answer this we ask wherein lies the right to tax at all? "Oh, the public good," "the general welfare," you say. Certainly: we have already occupied some space trying to teach that human welfare is the highest basis of right. Manifestly then, since the general welfare is the basis of the right of taxation, the limit of that right can only be measured by the limit of the general welfare.

Man, by constitutions and laws may set bounds, may prescribe what are called legal rights, but from a moral point of view, if it is right to take one-hundredth, one-fiftieth, or one-twentieth of private property for public use because the general welfare demands it, then it follows necessarily, that it is right to take one-tenth, one-fourth, one-half or all of private property whenever the general welfare demands it. But why does the President and other political leaders just at this juncture come out more radically than ever? The answer is found in the utterances of the President, who says in part: "At this moment we are passing through &c." and further on he says, "There is coming to be a great unrest." It is the business of statesmen to study closely the limits of the people's patience. The reason suggested by the President is about the only one that ever moves statesmen to do anything for the people that is not also to the interest of themselves and the capitalists which they represent. It is the same reason that existed in Australia and New Zealand when the people were threatening to capture the governments by either the ballot or the bullet. It is the same reason that existed in England three-quarters of a century ago, when, after several years of talking, Mr. Fox walked into Parliament one morning and said that "something must be done"; giving as his reasons for doing "something," that the people were suffering, were starving in fact, and that they were about to rise in rebellion. The last was the only real reason. The theory is that it is cheaper to give the people what they must have than have them take it themselves. Of course it must be preceded by a considerable amount of talking; and, like preaching "from a text," there is always a hope that they may be able to talk **from** the subject, interest the people in something else, and never return to it again. Talk is cheap, but usually, capitalism is required to make no other sacrifice than that which is found in "lip service."

CHAPTER XII.

LAW, ORDER AND ORGANIZATION.

It has been said that "Order is heaven's first law." Whenever any considerable number of material, active, moving forces operate at the same time in the same vicinity and over the same areas, there is apt to be more or less of disorder; for whenever two of these attempt to cross each other's path at the same time, there is a clash. Generally, each one is swerved somewhat from its course. The weaker

is swerved the more. Each yields more or less to the other and the weaker yields the more, sometimes nearly all its motion. Man is such a force. Human beings in society are material, living, moving active forces. When two individual persons or groups of persons pass at the same time athwart each other's pathway there is a clash. Each is swerved somewhat and the weaker is swerved the more. Sometimes he yields nearly all his motion and begins to move along with or in the same direction as the stronger.

But man is an intelligent being. He has a mind that directs his physical action; and, like all other intelligent beings, he has his preferences, his likes and dislikes; and having these, he chooses what his course of action shall be. And so when one such person or group of persons is swerved from a chosen course, unless the preferences are changed, there will be a struggle during the period of contact and an attempt to resume the original course afterward. This intervention of intelligence tends to cause more frequent collisions. The motives which prompt the preferences are multitudinous, but may be summed up in two general classes: First, those which affect one's own selfish interests, and second, those which affect the recognized rights and interests of others. The first may be called selfish motives and the second unselfish or moral motives. Wherever man's moral nature is sufficiently developed, he comes to recognize some actions as right and others as wrong, and, at times, pursues lines of action which he regards as against his own selfish interests, because of his recognition of the rights belonging to others and because of his brotherly sympathy toward them. And herein lies another cause of collision. Whenever man's recognized rights are trampled in the dust he puts up a moral protest against the infringement which causes an irritation and disorder that never ceases till the wrong is removed. In such case the irritation is a good thing for society. It is the friendly pain that prompts to the removal of the disease. No human society can have perfect order nor anything approaching perfection unless it is permeated by a vein of brotherly human sympathy and recognizes in a practical way the rights of all.

There are two methods by which irritation and disorder in society may be avoided: First, by kindly courteous and mutual concession and mutual recognition of each other's rights and interests. This method has sometimes worked tolerably well, but only where there is a healthy moral tone and the modes of life are simple; where there is much complexity it must ever prove a failure. Second, by an organized co-operation, which, arranging the lines of action of all to run

parallel, avoids the clashing of interests which would otherwise occur. In other words, wherever society becomes complicated it should be organized so that all its parts may work harmoniously together like a great machine, else there can be no great degree of effectiveness.

Competition is anarchistic. It has no law, no system, no organized method of action. It is chaotic. It is anarchy; for anarchy is a want of law, lack of system, lack of organization, a confusion, a disorder. Society as we have it to-day is mostly anarchy. After all the thunderings and denunciations against anarchism and all the howling for law and order by those who defend what is called the competitive system and oppose the introduction of the co-operative system, it is a fact that cannot be controverted that all the law and order, all the organization that exists in human affairs to-day, in short, all that is not anarchy, is the result of the co-operative principle. Come to think of it this thought seems so axiomatic as scarcely to require expression. Anarchy represents disconcerted, disorganized action, as opposed to co-operation which is the essence of concerted or organized action. Every organization of human beings, whether it be national, state, local, municipal, religious, benevolent, fraternal, political, business or commercial, is a co-operation. And every nation, every faction, every party consisting of two or more individuals is a co-operation; and every war, strife, or contention between nations, factions or parties with the disorder growing out of them, results from the co-operation being incomplete. Where co-operation ends disorder, contention and anarchy begin. In a true sense all war is anarchy in the fact that it produces disorder, but most of those who engage in war are not anarchists in the sense of desiring to dispense with all law. Generally those who oppose existing laws do so because they dislike those particular laws and desire to substitute for them others which suit them better. As we have already seen, co-operation may be either selfish or unselfish. Generally, the co-operation of a party or class against another party or class, is attended with more or less of injustice and oppression exercised by the dominating party or class against the party or class dominated. Any gross injustice or oppression is sure to develop sooner or later more or less social disorder; and so long as injustice and oppression exist, there will be social disorder, social disease, and the only way to reduce the latter to the minimum is by reducing the former to the minimum. For the purpose of providing order governments are established. The primitive condition of society was one of pure anarchy. The first beginnings of government, the first steps toward civilization were very simple.

Every advance or upward step was a step toward social order, social health, social organization. At a very early period savages were formed into tribes for the purpose of mutual defense and mutual selfish offense against their enemies. The tribal movements of each tribe was a co-operation. The co-operation was very simple, both in its methods and its objects, about the only function of government being effectiveness in war; and it is very remarkable how long that continued to be the only very important function, and how very conspicuous a place it still occupies in all the governments of the earth. And not only were the governments of the savage tribes confined to warlike preparation and operations; but to those of the simplest kind. The chieftain simply called about him his tribesmen and led them forth in marauding expeditions or to repel the incursions of their enemies, each one furnishing his own weapons and his own food, or his own part of it, and serving without pay except when there were spoils or plunder to be divided. Next came the confederation of tribes into nations having the functions of government enlarged so as to provide more elaborately for war and to include some things which were partially or wholly not of a warlike character.

As about all the early nations were monarchies there were royal houses to support. Then came the tax gatherer. Taxes must be levied and collected, not only to provide for the support of these in regal splendor, together with a great retinue of both civil and military officials, but for the purpose of arming, equipping, feeding and paying vast armies both regular and special, building ships, erecting public buildings and other public works, constructing roads, improving rivers and harbors, etc., these last being confined for the most part to such improvements as rendered the nation more effective in war. And in addition, there were laws and police regulations for the punishment of crime and the protection of all citizens in the enjoyment of their rights or what were called rights. For many centuries, in fact until within the last century, not much advancement was made by the nations of the earth beyond this. In all this there was co-operation, law, order and organization. Let us note, too, that in the first steps toward law, order and organization, there was a simple co-operation. Little law, little order, and practically no organization was required. The chief gave the signal and little order was necessary either in the march or the fight.

Such simple methods, however, were only adapted to the operations of small bodies of people. They were entirely inadequate to meet the demands of larger bodies acting in a national capacity. Nations could not conduct wars without

military organization. People could not live together in society and have any security in the enjoyment of their rights, especially their property rights, without the organization of civil government. Even with it there was, by reason of the defective and unjust laws and improper enforcement, generally little enough security.

During the past century the most highly civilized nations have been taking some steps in civil government beyond mere police regulations for making the people secure in the exercise of their legal rights. We now have public highways and bridges, instead of toll roads and bridges; publicly owned and managed schools and colleges, instead of those privately owned and managed; public postal systems, instead of private ones and in nearly all the leading nations public, instead of private ownership of railroads, telegraphs and telephones. Also in many cities and towns, there is municipal ownership and management of waterworks, street railways, electric light plants, telephones and fire extinguishing appliances.

Let us here stop and carefully note several very important points.

First, under both private and public ownership, all these things were and are publicly used; that is to say, they were and are, the means by which the people's wants are supplied.

Second, under private ownership there was a clash of antagonistic interests, a lack of organization, lack of system and lack of unity of interest and purpose which tended to render the service defective, while under public ownership there is systematic organization and unity of interest and purpose which is generally much more effective and satisfactory.

Third, under private ownership the only object being profits for the owners, there was little regard to justice and the people's interests and convenience, the officers and employees being expected to please the private owners, while under public ownership the only object is service to the public, the managers and employees being responsible to and expected to please the people who are the owners.

In the olden time most of the people were farmers. For the most part the farm was then privately used. A very small part of the comforts of life were then produced by specialists. The farmer produced nearly all that he used and usually sold only enough of the products to enable him to buy the few things he needed which required the work of specialists. Now it is different. As we look over the industrial field to-day, we find that practically all the industries are publicly used. It is needless to enumerate all the articles by name. You know them as well as I. They may all be

summed up in the one word service. Most of the labor of civilized man is performed in the production of articles of commerce, and whoever bestows such labor exercises a public function, that is to say, he performs a service that is used by many people, often by many thousands and frequently by many millions. So then we find that almost the whole industrial life has changed, so that from being a simple affair in which each one for the most part serves himself, it has come to be a complex, a complicated, a mutual interchange of services by all those who perform useful labor. Even the well-to-do farmer who sometimes thinks himself so independent uses the services of millions of others, while frequently millions of others use his services.

Concerning all the industries now privately owned a very little reflection will show that practically all of them are governed and influenced by the same conditions that we have mentioned as characterizing the others while they were privately owned. There is the same clashing of antagonistic interests, the same want of organization and system, and the same want of unity of interest and purpose. They are governed by the same single motive for production, namely, profits to the private owners. There is the same want of responsibility to the people and the same disregard of justice and the people's interests.

I have no doubt that in some places where it was proposed to substitute public roads and bridges for private ones, there were people who denounced it as class legislation, saying, "Let those who use the roads most, pay most for such use; therefore let the roads remain in the hands of the private owners who will be interested in collecting their pay." And there was logic in the argument. We cannot deny that the reasoning was good, especially in the light of the superficial ideas of human right which prevailed then and still prevail for the most part in society to-day. In the absence of any other reason it might have been taken as conclusive, but it was offset by reasons on the other side. The change was made under the protest of a part of the people. But who now advocates a return to toll roads and bridges.

When the proposal was made to establish public instead of private schools, there was wild and vehement, almost savage denunciation of the scheme. Some of these opponents almost tore their hair in rage. "Class legislation" became but a sickly, weak expression. "Robbery," "knavery" and "thievery" did not fill the bill. In fact no adjective could be found that was adequate to express their indignation. But how is it now? No doubt there are persons now who would like to destroy our public school systems, but few are willing

to face a storm of public indignation and express their opposition.

Before the national postal system was introduced it cost five to twenty cents to send a letter by private post. Not only was it expensive, but, being unorganized, the service was uncertain, unsatisfactory and poor. Yet the proposal to nationalize it was met with opposition. "It will bankrupt the government," they said. But to oppose it now would be to become a candidate for the insane asylum. Government ownership of railways, telegraphs and telephones have been receiving the same opposition. It has been hooted and denounced vehemently. Yet the opposition is rapidly diminishing in this country, and its popularity is making a phenomenal growth. In those countries where government ownership is in operation, it seems to give satisfaction. Some American travellers in central Europe find fault with the cheapness and unkept condition of the cars, but this to my mind only proves the success of the experiment, proves that it is conducted with a view of pleasing the people; for, a very great part of the people being poor, the main necessary feature for pleasing them must be cheapness. The uncomfortable accommodations signify little to people who are unable to afford better at home. As to municipal ownership, I have had little opportunity for personal observation and have taken no pains to investigate it; but it seems to be an improvement over private ownership, notwithstanding the power of corporate greed and capitalistic chicanery.

And so it has been all along the way. Every advance has been made in the face of fierce opposition. At every step a motley crowd, headed by scheming politicians, have thrown themselves athwart the pathway of progress, yelling themselves hoarse, and crying "Stop! Stop! Stop! Death and destruction are just ahead!" And now that it is proposed to extend public ownership, to include all the industries and provide a democratic management, and just distribution; in other words to establish Socialism, the same motley crowd or same sort of crowd that call themselves "The great conservative and eminently respectable element of society," have planted themselves squarely across the way and are yelling frantically, "Stop! Stop! Stop! Socialism would destroy all incentive! Socialism would make the people all alike just like two peas! Socialism would destroy our liberties! Socialism would take the last cow you have! Under Socialism who would do the dirty work? Socialism would destroy the home! Socialism is paternalism! Socialism is robbery! Socialism is anarchy! **SOCIALISM MUST BE CRUSHED!**" These may stop the wheels for a short time. They cannot

turn them backward. The wheels of progress never turn backward. There may be some delay, but finally, the way will be cleared, the march will be resumed and no power will be able to stop its progress. Afterward, the world will smile at the childish silliness of the crowd that yelled.

Yes, Socialists propose to complete the organization of society which has moved slowly forward during the centuries past but which is now moving at a greatly accelerated velocity. Socialists claim that since under private ownership there is so little system and that little is often little more than a system of robbery; that generally, so little regard is paid to justice and the people's interests; that there is so little order and so much antagonism that it is simply anarchy and confusion; that therefore private ownership is a failure as a means of providing for human welfare, in short, that it is impracticable, and that considering especially the fact that all the industries are publicly used, they ought to be publicly owned and managed.

It must appear readily to any thinking person, that the first method of organization is likely to be far from being the best. The teachings of experience will, no doubt, introduce great changes. In these days when the necessity for and the general plain methods of organization are so well understood, it seems hardly necessary to multiply words showing the necessity nor to devote space to explaining just how we could organize when we do not know just what method of organization will be adopted. Yet we often hear the question, "How are you going to do it?" And the almost as frequent assertion, "it can't be done?" These often come from persons who call themselves organizers. The fact is, it has been said so often that Socialism is impracticable, and those who said it have looked so wise and spoken with such a degree of assurance, that it has been generally accepted, swallowed whole without stopping to consider that it is but a plain simple problem of organization, large in its scope it is true, but simple nevertheless, not complicated.

When the first great chieftain having collected together a number of tribes in opposition to some other confederation, and finding that the large number of men obstructed each other's movements proposed to organize the men so as to secure concerted action and avoid confusion, no doubt many opposed it. "Never saw it done that way. It can't be done." And when it was proposed to organize civil government in order to collect taxes and provide for the settlement of disputes between individuals, no doubt there was opposition. "Better let each one furnish for the war just what he pleases. That is the way we always have done; and as to disputes, better

let them fight it out the old way." It is not strange if men reasoned that way then. Organization was then a new thing. It is not strange if there was, at first, some opposition to government ownership of railroads, telegraphs and telephones, on the ground that it was too big an undertaking. But now, since the government ownership proposition has been applied and found a success by all the great nations of Europe and in other parts of the world; since municipal ownership has been tested as it has; since civil service and postal organization have been tested; since people have become more or less familiar with the facts of the efficiency of organization in the movements of great armies and navies, and last but not least, since they have witnessed as they have during the past two decades the organization and rise of many great corporations and have seen the confederation of these into mammoth trusts that are now sweeping the masses off their feet and continually hurling them into the great maelstrom of financial despair—since in all these the people have become so well acquainted with the possibilities of organization, it seems a little strange that they should hesitate, because of its magnitude, at the Socialistic proposition to organize all the industries. In fact, if we view it rightly, its very magnitude is but a plain reason for organization. It goes without saying that the more people there are working together in any of life's activities, the greater the need of organization. Then, when we consider that all those who work at useful employment are in a sense working together to produce the necessities of life, we readily see the necessity of organization. When I say working together in a sense, I mean all engaged in the same general employment each producing what all use, but in another sense they are not working together. They are working at cross purposes, are pulling against each other, and this fact argues most forcibly. It suggests the very fundamental objects of organization, the avoiding of such counter pulling and pushing and cross action, and the securing of parallel, concerted, united action.

And here we may very profitably devote a little space to the consideration of another example or class of examples of modern organization. I refer to machinery. And what is a machine? A machine is a mechanical device having parts, organized and fitted together so as to produce concerted action. A great machine is one having many parts all acting harmoniously together. Now, the thought I wish to impress is this: If the ingenuity of man is sufficient to take inanimate iron, steel, wood and other materials and construct great machines that almost seem to have life and accomplish such great results, why could not society, consisting of animate, liv-

ing, moving, intelligent human beings, be organized so as to operate as a great machine with intelligence to guide and regulate its movements at every point? "Oh, but," says some wise acre, "their **intelligence** would be a **great obstacle!**" Grand thought this; but would it? Has it proven so in the past? Have army and naval officers found the intelligence of their men a great obstacle to the concerted movements of armies and navies? And does history confirm this assertion by showing that, as a rule, the battle was against the more intelligent and in favor of the more stupid? Did Dewey find intelligence an obstacle at Manila? To ask all these questions is but to answer them.

Yes, it seems a little strange that people nowadays, who are so well acquainted with the facts, advantages, benefits and necessities of organization should hesitate here, but a little study of human nature reveals the fact that most people reason little on anything outside of the business in which they are engaged. Often with facts before them sufficient to enable them to form a rational conclusion on a subject, they get their conclusions ready made from someone who seems to know, without stopping to think for themselves whether they are true or false; and this often where the person knows less of the subject and is less capable of judging than themselves. We are developing into an age of specialists. The specialist talks very glibly, often eloquently of things in his line. Naturally he speaks with a great deal of self assurance, and often he makes strong impressions on those who are not specialists in his line, who swallow his assertions whole without investigation. The politician is a specialist, or passes as such. Often he is a real specialist in one respect and a pretended specialist in another, that is to say, he understands perfectly how to deceive people and get their votes, but knows next to nothing of the political principles he claims to stand for. So, when he is asked about Socialism, he looks very wise, and with a great deal of self assurance, replies with a great deal of firmness and decision, that Socialism is impracticable. He says Socialism is impracticable because it is too big a thing; because it is unnatural; because it would destroy our liberties, and because it would destroy the family, etc. He says all this to people who well know if they would stop to think, that its very magnitude is an unanswerable argument in favor of it; who would know if they stopped to think, that instead of Socialism being unnatural it is capitalism that is unnatural in that it mars and destroys the happiness of man by its continued oppressions, warrings, jarrings and fightings, and that Socialism is natural; that co-operation is the natural condition of man's activities, and that from fellowship and

brotherly sympathy and helpfulness, springs the highest enjoyments of earth, in fact, we would perhaps not miss it far to say about all the enjoyment that is worthy the name.

They well know, if they would stop and think, that under Socialism, there would be no incentive to graft in the civil service, the postal service and other departments of public activity. They know that there is graft in those departments now; and, if they stopped to think, would readily see that the present tendency toward corruption must make it much more difficult to maintain satisfactorily the organization of those departments. They also know full well that in spite of these corruptions, these departments are successful to such a degree that no sane person would for a moment harbor the thought of dispensing with them; and if they took time to reason a little further and to consider the difficulty in all governmental organization occasioned by the tendency to corruption, they would conclude that it is not extravagant to expect that with the incentive to corruption practically all eliminated, as it undoubtedly would be under Socialism, it would be a simpler proposition to organize and manage all the industries, than it has been to do the same with those now under governmental, state and municipal supervision. They also know, if they would stop and think, that instead of Socialism destroying our liberties, it would be the greatest conservator of liberty; for, with a very meagre understanding of what capitalism is, and of what Socialism is, they would know that Socialism would secure to each one the enjoyment of the highest form of liberty conceived by man, namely, liberty to do right and protection against wrong; that Socialism proposes to give each one an equal right of access to the earth and its resources, not simply an abstract right, but a privilege or opportunity; that it would secure to each one the right and privilege of receiving the full product of his toil. They well know, if they stopped to think just a little, that capitalism grants only abstract rights to most people, denying them free access to the earth and its resources while refusing to protect them in their rights, and permitting them to be robbed of most of the product of their toil; and if they reasoned a little further, they would see that many of the so-called rights of society are simply wrongs in the exercise of which a special class is protected.

And then these people hear from this owl-faced gentleman the very startling information that Socialism would break up the family, would destroy the home. This caps the climax.

What a withering charge is this! Yet those who hear it, if they know the mere rudiments of Socialism, know that the proposition of Socialism is that the family shall remain in-

tact; that families shall retain their separate existence. They would know, if they stopped to think, that there is no reason why the family should cease, and, in fact, not so much as there is now; for it would be far easier to maintain a separate family existence under the conditions which Socialism promises; and when they came to think of it they would see that the tendency of the postal and other civil service is not to cause its employees to abandon the family existence; that the fact is, capitalism has furnished a most crucial test showing the stability and permanence of the family, especially if equality cuts any figure in the matter, as the opponents of Socialism claim; for in the tenement houses are many families together, each subsisting on an equally pitiful wage, and separated from each other only by a chalk line; that notwithstanding this the family still remains, and that morally speaking, even families under such environment, will compare quite favorably with those of the very wealthy so many of whom turn night into day by their dissipations.

Yes, there are many people who know these things or would know them if only they stopped to think. But therein lies the trouble. The American people are not slow in acquiring knowledge. Their chief failure lies in not digesting and appropriating the knowledge they have. As a rule they follow the line of least resistance, get their thoughts ready made and leave the real thinking to others, and it is not at all strange if, in these days of graft, the thoughts are often moulded in the interest of the thinker and against the interest of the receiver. Some may be ready to say that they got the thoughts from some other than a politician. But if they did, the chances are, nine out of ten, that they got them from another, who got them from another, etc., who got them from a politician. Such thoughts are usually passed very rapidly along down the line. There is also a disposition to follow the line of least resistance in holding to the old ruts, and the politician is careful to encourage it. He says virtually, "Be sure you keep in the old ruts; look out for the Socialist; he is liable to break the ruts and lead you out, and if you get out you will be lost, for you will not know where you are."

So then, when the Socialist agitator comes around and sends a few Socialist ideas clattering against his cranium, the average man is apt to brace himself and say, "I'm from Missouri. You'll have to show me."

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SOCIALIST PROGRAM.

Very well, then, let us begin at once the showing process, in an attempt to outline a general, workable, practicable program of Socialism. To do so we must suppose that the Socialists have come into the possession of the government, both national and state; must not forget our definition of Socialism, public ownership, public management, just distribution of income and private ownership of distributed product, not omitting the central thought, the pith of it all, the substitution of co-operation for competition; and we must adhere closely to our three cardinal moral principles. Following these what we want to do is to organize all our industrial activities under one general national interest, with such separate state and local interests as may be deemed convenient.

Let us look forward in our imagination to the time when the educational work that is now going on has been completed. The people have learned theoretically the principles of Socialism. They have adopted them by electing Socialists to office in all departments of government, both in the nation and in the states, or most of them. If any held back the others could go on without them. The holding back would not last long. All things are ready and the people are willing and anxious to usher in the co-operative commonwealth. We are now ready to doff the tattered old garment of capitalism, that is covered with fragmentary pictures and reminiscences of past wars and carnage and crime and cruelty, and don the new and spotlessly white garment, having emblazoned upon it in shining letters the word **brotherhood**. We are now ready to organize. How shall we begin? Ask a man of average intelligence if he knows anything about the organization of an army or navy, a civil government, the school business or the postal business, and he will probably say, "Yes, I know something of those things; I know that they are organized."

Do you think you could organize an army?

After a little reflection he says, "Yes. I might not do a very good job at it. There would perhaps be a great room for improvement; but I think I could organize it."

Could you organize a navy, the civil service, the postal business, the school business or the railroad business?

"Yes."

How would you proceed to organize any branch of activity?

"I would look out and appoint over each department of the institution to be organized the man or men who appear

to be the wisest concerning the work of that department and let him or them organize it."

This is the general plan of organization that has been practiced for more than three thousand years, since the days when the tribes of Israel set before their great leader their wise men whom he made to be "captains over thousands and captains over fifties, and captains over tens, and officers among the people." The exact methods of organization are almost as various as the institutions to be organized. There is a variation in details. Sometimes the organizer is self-appointed; sometimes he is appointed by a higher power; sometimes elected by the people, and sometimes by the representatives of the people, but in one essential respect there has not been much change in three thousand years. Almost invariably, organization begins at the top and proceeds downward. This method is the best that can be done when the masses are ignorant of the subject matter of organization. Even democracies are almost invariably content to follow this old time method. The people are expected to study men principally, and principles and methods a very little, and they do not usually exceed these expectations. No wonder there has been corruption. But, like many other evils that have afflicted society in the past it was unavoidable under all the circumstances. It gathered as a clog on the wheels of progress; but the swamp must be crossed, and the best that could be done was to wade steadily along, paying little attention to the milder accretions, and raking off (with a "muck rake" or other primitive tool) the grosser forms of corruption.

With all its drawbacks this method of organization has accomplished much good in the past, and I see no reason why it could not be continued under Socialism and result in a great improvement over our present system. The powers and functions of our federal, state and municipal governments could all be enlarged and each of the industries could be assigned to such departments of these as seemed best fitted to handle it, until all were included. This would be Socialism, at least in form. It would be a defective Socialism if it failed to carry out the expressed will of the people, to provide a just distribution, or to secure to each the private ownership and enjoyment of his just share of the social product. With these, it might still be cumbersome, but it would nevertheless be perfect in the sense that it would be all Socialism and no capitalism. It would not be a perfect machine because it would be fashioned after the imperfect machine of capitalism. Yet it would undoubtedly run far more smoothly, because it would be almost free from all incentive to and opportunity for corruption. Under Socialism nearly all financial dealings be-

tween private persons would cease and be nearly altogether with the public. All capital would be owned by the public. There would be no reason for great individual accumulations of the products of labor and such would be effectually discouraged or forbidden to extend beyond certain limits. Moreover the public would furnish storehouses for all such increment, the private ownership of each being indicated by certificate and book account.

Considering then all these points, we readily see that under Socialism there would be little incentive and little opportunity for corruption in government. Practically, there would be none except what might possibly result from a scramble for the best places, and even in this there could hardly be any opportunity for bribery except by the mutual helpfulness of a combination of two or more persons in securing the best positions. The tendency in this direction would, however, be very slight; for the main temptation, the prospect of a considerable financial reward would be removed. No one could obtain any but a petty advantage, and it is reasonable to expect that under such an environment, the public sentiment would become so strong against petty striving, that few would risk its censure and yield to so small temptation. It seems to me that any thinking person having but a bare definition of Socialism should be able to see, with a little careful reflection, that the proposition of Socialism is but a plain, simple matter of organization, and not only simple, but simplified by the elimination of the worst difficulty that besets our present system, and that with our old time methods of organization it would be reasonable to expect it to become such a success that, compared with our present society, it would be as moonlight to starlight. And yet Socialism reveals a far better method; a method in which the new Socialist machine stands forth as a new model, having abandoned many of the useless and cumbersome parts of the old capitalistic machine and been fashioned to suit the proposed new environment; and which being applied, may be expected to produce so much greater results as to entitle it to be called the sunlight method.

And what will be the new environment? But first what of the present?

Our present society is built up entirely on selfishness. The chief concern of each one is to enhance his own individual interests. As a rule he takes readily to any proposition that promises to enhance the value of his holdings. These are usually confined to the particular locality in which he lives. The people of a particular locality in a county work together to secure some county enterprise or institution, as, for in-

stance, a county seat that will be a benefit to the whole neighborhood. In such case, the chief motive of each individual is that he may advance his own individual interest. In the same manner the people of one part of a state will unite to promote the financial interests of themselves. Likewise, also, the people of a state will all work together to draw their way some great national enterprise or institution, or seek the promotion of whatever will benefit the people of that state; and in all these cases, as a rule, the motive that is uppermost in each individual is his own self interest, the hope that his property may be increased in value, or that his home may become a pleasanter place in which to live.

But the selfish motive is not the only motive. Nearly all people have more or less of what is called public spirit. In spite of all the cultivation of selfishness which our present society promotes, this public spirit still lives and still continues to crop out in some form or other. True, some people seem to be almost entirely without it, and the proportional number of such people seems to be increasing, but on the other hand there are persons so public spirited, that they are ready at any time to sacrifice their own private interests for the public good. But even in such case, the public spirit usually finds its strongest expression in seeking the promotion of that which is nearest home. Many a man through public spirit works to promote the interests of his own neighborhood, town or county, who takes little interest in the welfare of the state, and some take a deep interest in what concerns their own state, who care little for national affairs.

And so we find society as at present constituted, divided and subdivided into petty conflicting local interests. The people of one part of a state being cut off by a mountain range or in some way having interests which vary widely from the interests of the majority, are often neglected and caused to suffer greatly for want of the legislation they need, because it does not concern the interests of the majority. So also a state or a number of states in one quarter may suffer for want of national legislation. Then the various gradations in wealth divide the people into a variety of classes with diverse conflicting class interests. Also diversity of occupation causes a still further subdivision. Many laws are made in the interest of the very rich that are of little benefit to the middle class and very poor. Some laws benefit the great millionaires and injure the smaller ones, and vice versa. Also, some laws benefit the middle class which are against the proletarian, and vice versa. Lastly, each occupation calls for laws that are of little or no interest, or are against the interests of some or all the other classes. What I am trying to get before the reader

is the fact that, under our present system, besides the general competitive squabble which is too much of a labyrinth, too anarchical to be described, there is a continual clashing of class interests and dissatisfaction with the laws, by reason of the diversity of the local, financial and occupational interests already mentioned. There is a continual complaining. In all my life I do not remember hearing but one man say that he was satisfied with the laws as they are, and he was a poor foreigner who did not know enough of our laws to be dissatisfied with them.

And now, with this picture before the mind let us turn and inquire how it would be under Socialism.

To begin with, Socialism proposes the public ownership of all productive industries, all that portion of wealth called capital. This would mean that if the United States should adopt Socialism, when the transition is made, by whatever means it may be accomplished, each owner of capital will yield his ownership to the government and receive instead, along with all other citizens, an equal interest in all the capital of the whole with an equal right to apply his labor along with the other partners and receive a share proportional to his efforts. This would do away with all private competition in buying and selling. There could no longer be a clashing along the lines drawn on various gradations of wealth ownership. All local and sectional diversity of interests would be completely wiped out. Practically, the people living in Maine would have the same interest in the material development of California as the Californians themselves; the inhabitants of the Puget Sound country would be benefited about as much by the opening up of new industries in the southern states as the southerners themselves, and the people of each industry would be as much interested in seeing all other industries properly developed as in their own. The fact is that under Socialism all would be equally interested in such a development of the various localities, and in such a proportional development of the various industries, as would supply the wants of all with the least effort and inconvenience. There could be no class interests, strictly speaking. The only semblance of class lines would be those dividing between the various occupations. There might be a little crowding for the best places, especially if they paid better wages, but this tendency would surely not be very strong since there would be no opportunity to amass an individual fortune. If there should prove to be such a tendency, it could be remedied for the most part by applying Mr. Bellamy's method of reducing the hours of those having the most unpleasant work.

Under our present system, we are ever jealous of any-

thing like an infringement of our state rights and are up in arms against anything that smacks of usurpation. We feel that we are the most interested in our own local affairs, and therefore that our interests are safest in our own hands. But under Socialism all would be changed. I see no reason why state governments should be continued at all, though I think probably it would be found best to divide the country into a number of sections for convenience of administration.

Private ownership of wealth having principally ceased, private financial dealings having been dispensed with, and the causes of crime having for the most part been removed, most of our present laws and our present governmental machinery would become obsolete. As there would be no longer any reason for sectional and local representation, it would be better to abandon our present method of representation by states and districts, and adopt instead a method which has generally been advocated by Socialist writers, and which follows the only line of classification left in society, namely, that of occupation.

The following quotation is from Lawrence Gronlund's *Co-operative Commonwealth*, pp. 191-6.

"The referendum is expedient because the stability and goodness of all laws and institutions depend on their suitableness. I have compared political institutions to coats that may or may not fit the backs. The referendum will insure that the coat will fit the back; in other words that the measures adopted are commensurate with the development of the people. If the coat does not fit, if a given measure does not suit them, they will simply reject it.

"It is expedient because it, and it alone, will arouse and keep alive in the people the interest in public affairs. It is a notorious fact that the voters in the United States, and in all countries, are absolutely indifferent to—that many look with a sort of contempt on—the electoral franchise; and the humbug of representation to which we adverted in the preceding chapter is a sufficiently good reason. Voters will naturally remain indifferent as long as a political campaign means but a strife for candidates. Whenever they do vote they will continue to do so from the same reasons which solely influence them now; to wit, habit, or the desire to advance a friend or a 'hero,' or the chance of getting a drink.

"But when the voters have measures before them—not merely general, and therefore vague, constitutional provisions, but direct special measures—to discuss, and then to ratify or reject, it may be fairly expected that they will take a considerable and increasing interest in public affairs. Then, also, they will very likely come more and more to appreciate the fact that suffrage is not a right at all—if it were, votes would indeed be things to be sold or given away at pleasure—but a public trust.

"The referendum is expedient, because bills will then be intelligently discussed before they become laws. We shall then no more witness the indecency that important laws, the provisions of which even often are unknown to the legislators, are enacted in the hurry of the last night of a session, under the spur of the party whip. Then we shall no longer see huge volumes of trash issuing yearly from legislative halls, but shall have few, and none but necessary laws.

"But this is all nonsense to propose to get along without representatives. The people of a large country like that of the United States cannot possibly pass upon all laws."

"Yes, we know that once upon a time somebody made a remark of that kind, and that it has been echoed and reechoed ever since. Humanity does really resemble a flock of sheep, which are known to be so conscientious that, if you hold a stick before the wether so that he is forced to vault in his passage, the whole flock will do the like when the stick is withdrawn.

"Why cannot the people even of so populous and extensive a country as the union, vote upon all laws. Do not, as a matter of fact, the people vote to reject or accept the constitutions of their several States? Do they not practically vote for the president? What reason in the world is there why they cannot just as well vote upon a law as upon a constitution or upon men?

"And what reason is there for the people to have representatives at all? True, they needs must have men to direct affairs and to do certain work for them. These men are their agents for certain purposes, but in no sense their representatives. It is the fictitious 'representative' character that is father of all parliamentary nonsense, blundering work, and corruption of practical politics.

"Under the Socialist regime the administrators will form a working body and not a talking body. The people in their organic capacity will watch, stimulate and control them, but not meddle with details. Their agents will have been put into the positions they occupy, because they know better than anybody else how to contrive the means and execute the measures demanded. They will administer the nation's affairs as a pilot directs and handles a ship, but the direction of the ship of state will be indicated by public opinion.

"But the pertinacious curiosity of critics will, undoubtedly, not be satisfied before they have a sketch of such a Socialist administration before them for examination.

"Well, anybody can construct such an administration in his imagination as well as we can, if he only will keep steadily before him these three requirements: first, that all appointments be made from below; next, that the directors stay in office as long as they give satisfaction and not one moment beyond; and, lastly, that all laws and regulations of a general nature must be first ratified by those immediately interested. We have no better means of guessing how those who come after us will construct their administrative machinery in detail than anybody else; and modern Socialists are not fond of laying down rules for the guidance of coming generations.

"In order, however, to show that an administration without president, without national or debating societies of any kind, is really possible, I shall draw such a one in outline; but please bear in mind that Socialism must not be made responsible for this fancy sketch of mine.

* * * * *

"Suppose, then, every distinct branch of industry, of agriculture and also teachers, physicians, etc., to form, each trade and profession by itself, a distinct body, a trades union (I simply use the term because it is convenient,) a guild, a corporation managing its internal affairs itself, but subject to collective control.

"Suppose, further, that the 'heelers' among the operatives in a shoe factory in a given place come together and elect their foreman, and that the 'tappers,' the 'solers,' the 'finishers' and whatever else the various operators may be called, do likewise. Suppose that these foremen assemble and elect a superintendent of the factory, and that the superintendents of

all the shoe factories in that district, in their turn elect a—let us call him—district superintendent. Again, we shall suppose these district superintendents of the whole boot and shoe industry to assemble themselves somewhere from all parts of the country and elect a bureau chief, and he with other bureau chiefs of related industries—say, the tanning industry—to elect a chief of department.

"In the same manner I shall suppose that we have got a chief for every group of related mechanical, and agricultural and mining pursuits, a chief for the teachers, another for the physicians, another for the judges; further, one or more chiefs for transportation, one or more chiefs for commerce; in fact, suppose that there is not a social function whatever that does not converge in some way in such chief of department.

"However, we do not want too many of these chiefs, for we mean to make a working body, not a talking body, out of them. I mean that these chiefs of departments shall form the national board of administrations, whose function it shall be to supervise the whole social activity of the country. Each chief will supervise the internal affairs of his own department, and the whole board control all those matters in which the general public is interested.

"But just as all inferior officers, this national board will be nothing but a body of administrators, they will be merely trusted agents to do a particular work; they will be in no sense, 'governors' or 'rulers,' or, if anybody should choose to call their supervision and control 'government,' it will, at all events, rather be a government over things than over men. For they will decree no laws.

"If a general law is thought to be expedient, one that will affect the people at large or those of any one department, then we suppose this national board simply to agree on the general features of the measure, and thereupon intrust the drafting of the proper bill either to the chief whose department it principally concerns, or what might be the usual course, to the chief of the judges. When this draft has been discussed and adopted, the board will submit it to the people either of the whole country or of the department, as may be, for their ratification. The national board is thus no law maker, therefore no 'government' but an executive body strictly."

Continuing the same subject, we quote from "Modern Socialism," by Chas. H. Vail, pp. 75-6.

"Each directing officer would be held responsible, not only for his own work, but for that of his subordinates. While appointments would be made from below, dismissals would come from above. 'Subordinates elect, superiors dismiss.'

"This would obviate divided responsibility by making the officers responsible to some one person. In case any officer abused his power, he himself would be dismissed by his superior. Should he be found inefficient, a foreman could be removed by the superintendent, a superintendent by the bureau chief, or a bureau chief by the department chief. The latter official, however, would be made responsible to the whole body of his subordinates. If any department or member thereof became dissatisfied with the chief, the imperative mandate could be called into service in the same manner as the initiative. That is, any person could draw up a petition demanding the removal of the officer, and upon receiving the signatures of the majority of the department, his office would be declared vacant by the proper officers and an election called to fill the vacancy. The initiative and imperative mandate could, if thought advisable, be used in case of every officer. Thus the foreman of any shop or superintendent of any factory could be recalled by the very persons who placed him in power, the majority always ruling. The officer thus deposed

would take his place among the rank and file and there remain, **unless** elevated by a subsequent election.

"Is not this democracy, an administration by the people? Every man would have a part in the administration of affairs. That such a system would work well in practice we may see by studying labor organizations and trade unions. These unions furnish the skeletons of the future commonwealth.

"That Socialism would greatly improve government is evident, because it would make administration of vital concern to all the people.

"It would raise into prominence a nobler class of men, and draw into the public service the talent of the country. As the prosperity of all would depend upon efficient management, the full moral strength and mental acumen of the nation would be at the public service."

Here we have a practicable program, perfectly adapted to the new conditions, with nearly all our present unwieldy governmental machinery left out. It would be worse than useless. There would be little to legislate about. Nearly all our present legislation relates to private ownership of property and to crimes resulting directly or indirectly from it. The new order being once established, legislation will be confined to general methods of organization. The details would be left to the administration just as in our postal department or in the civil service.

There is one particular circumstance, the influence of which in the promotion of the success of Socialism by the methods of administration just outlined, can hardly be overestimated; and that is the fact that under the new order each one will be thoroughly instructed and trained for the special work he expects to perform, and will therefore be able to vote intelligently for both men and measures connected with the work of his department.

I prefer to use the term government as applied to the Socialistic state, for two reasons: First because it is more readily understood by the reader; and secondly, because I believe in yielding obedience to properly constituted authority; and I know of no word that better signifies the strength and authority of the collective will expressed by the referendum ballot and executed by the people's chosen agents. But government under Socialism will have a very different meaning from what it has now. Then, it will mean the whole people: now, it means an organized body over and above the people, supposed to be chosen by, and acting for them, but in reality, for the most part, chosen by the plutocracy and acting as their exclusive agents. Government under Socialism will be an actual, and not merely a theoretical self government.

It will be the duty of the government to provide for all the wants of all the people, each receiving in proportion to his effort. This will require systematic effort in production;

and let us not forget that production in the economic sense, includes every step that is necessary to produce the raw material, transform it into the finished product, and transport it to the consumer in the form in which it is to be used. This will require much cool, careful calculating. Here the statistician's position will loom up as the most important office in the nation.

The importance of economy in determining the amount and place of producing the raw material and in questions pertaining to manufacture and transportation, would call for an able statistician, or possibly a board of statisticians with an able corps of assistants, each understanding thoroughly the work of his own department. This work would be the most arduous and uncertain at first and during the experimental stage. Of course, sound policy would require that at all times, due care be taken to provide against a shortage of the necessities of life. This would be a matter of the highest importance at the beginning; and to make sure on this point, it would be good policy to plan especially for the production at first of a superabundance of such staple food products as could be kept through several years without waste. After a few years experience the statisticians could determine more accurately how much of each article would be wanted, and where it could be most economically produced. And we must not overlook the fact that some articles must be supplied from abroad, while others that could be provided for at home may be more easily obtained by producing still other articles and exchanging with foreign countries. In such cases it would devolve upon our government to enter into reciprocal agreements with other countries, by which such articles could be obtained. Thus in the very introduction of Socialism we would substitute science for chance, co-operative, concerted action for competitive, disconcerted action; order for disorder; organization for disorganization, and economy for waste.

Time and space forbid that we should undertake to enumerate the points of waste in our present system that would be saved under Socialism; but we may begin to comprehend something of their aggregate magnitude, if we consider how small a proportion of the men who are fit for service, are now employed at what under Socialism would be necessary work. It is said they are only about one-third. When we consider the great number of idle rich and idle poor, the number employed in advertising, the great number of merchants and shopmen great and small with their armies of agents, solicitors, salesmen, clerks and deliverymen, all doing a work of distribution which could probably be done

much easier by one-tenth the number working systematically with machinery; when we consider the enormous expense of buildings, fences and other improvements for private operation, which, under Socialism would be unnecessary, the time spent by employers hunting for men and by men hunting for work; the time spent in looking up the best market for buying and the best market for selling; also the waste resulting from the overproduction of some articles—when we consider all these and reflect that we have but touched the border, we cannot fail to see that the number on the other side who are not now engaged in what, under Socialism would be useful service, is very large. Suppose it is only half, and that the workers now work on an average ten hours per day, then to produce the same by the same methods all working, would only require five hours per day; or, if it is two-thirds as claimed, only three and one-third hours per day. But this is only a mere beginning of economy. Much of the work formerly done by hand is now done by machines, the same number of men doing with machines from five to one thousand times as much as was formerly done by hand. Socialism will multiply this advantage by bringing into use far greater machines, and also by introducing machines to do most of the work now done by hand.

Socialism will also economize by the application of science and large scale methods of industry, in manufacture, in transportation, in agriculture. In the last of these there will probably be the greatest advancement made in both science and large scale methods. To the thinking mind, the economic possibilities of Socialism that are now in sight are simply wonderful. And still there is the great unexplored field lying beyond. What wonder that Socialists should seem as dreamers to those who have not investigated the subject? I feel sure that I would be keeping far within the lines of a careful and cautious conservatism, to say that with each one working but barely enough to meet the requirements of his physical health, enough could be produced to supply all the material wants of the people, leaving them all the leisure necessary for the cultivation of their higher natures. If any preferred to use his leisure time in providing for himself more of the luxuries of life, probably he would be permitted to do so; but I feel confident that leisure for the cultivation of the mind in all its phases, moral, intellectual, social and religious, will come to be regarded as one of the chief necessities of life. I know that some have hesitated and doubted and feared at this point. "Idleness," they say, "begets mischief."

I have no doubt that some will misuse their leisure. I

think probably a considerable number will do so at first. Those who fear that under Socialism the people would be "all alike just like two peas" will be agreeably surprised to find their fears not realized, but that there are still different degrees of standing in society, based on moral and intellectual excellence, instead of as now, on financial excellence. One's standing will then depend mostly on how he uses his leisure time; and that great improvement will result from the use of this higher standard, I have not the least doubt. And since man has advanced in the past in the midst of corruptions, discouragements and adversity, how can we doubt that he would amid the bright and encouraging environment of Socialism, with so many of the evils and temptations removed. It is true that in the lower stages of civilization man is beset with more or less of indolence; but every step upward brings new aspirations which prompt to new efforts corresponding to the new opportunities afforded; and I have no doubt that the ushering in of Socialism will unlock from millions of breasts the aspirations for a grander, higher and purer life which the new environment would permit and encourage. The higher man rises in the scale, the more he comes to realize that his highest enjoyment is promoted by the symmetrical development of all his faculties, and for this, Socialism would afford the amplest opportunity to all; and not only opportunity, but great encouragement, while in our present society such opportunity comes to comparatively few, and to those few, generally accompanied by great temptations amid which the higher aspirations are usually choked out.

CHAPTER XIV.

DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPATIONS AND POPULATIONS.

We often hear people asking if there will not under Socialism be a scrambling for the best places while the disagreeable work will go begging? This, at first glance, seems a very serious objection; but when we consider the changed environment of Socialism, which would appeal to the unselfish side of man's nature instead of the selfish, the objection does not seem so great; even in our present society, man's better nature when properly appealed to, responds with a heartiness that is really encouraging. In cases of war, the patriotism of the people is appealed to. They are impressed with the fact that the welfare of all depends on each one, and each realizes his individual responsibility and discharges it.

Such appeals are not usually in vain. Why then, could not the same appeal be made in time of peace to the great army of workers in a Socialist nation. We often find shirkers but I feel safe in saying that where men are placed upon their honor and permitted to do the kind of work that suits them, the proportional number of shirkers is very small. I very well remember the days when the men of each neighborhood "swapped" work and did the threshing of all. I remember too, that occasionally there were charges of shirking, but I do not remember of ever hearing of a crew where so many shirked as to cause the work to seriously lag. It is related that when the New Zealand Government built their own railways the men organized themselves into a working force, the stronger taking the harder places and leaving the easier work for the weaker. Socialism must begin with the kind of men that are developed by the latter end of capitalism, and since the effect of capitalism is to make men more and more selfish as time passes, it would be well to seek some sort of device to guard against a selfish struggle for the best positions. And again, we find that the philosophy of Socialism is not wanting. Mr. Edward Bellamy, in his renowned work, "Looking Backward," sets forth a plan which meets the case fully. It is simply to increase the number of hours work in those occupations that have too many applicants and reduce the number of hours in those having too few. A few experiments would determine, approximately, the amount of work required in each in order to secure the right number of applicants. The same thing could be accomplished by varying wages instead of the number of hours or amount of work.

Mr. Bellamy, while doing a grand work for the cause of Socialism, made prominent several things that are not necessary parts of Socialism. Among these were: First, government by those who had passed the age of industrial service; second, a sort of militarism, a rather harmless sort perhaps, in fact, little more than an extreme expression for thorough organization; third, equal wages.

The word equality stands for an ideal that seems to have been uppermost in his mind. It is one of the closely related group—equality, concerted movement, co-operative action, brotherly sympathy and brotherly helpfulness, which, all combined, form the Socialist ideal and may all be summed up in the one word, brotherhood. In my opinion, this equality ideal, is not so popular as it ought to be, not so popular as it will be when the people are differently educated. Some have a great horror of being "all alike, just like two peas." This idea is born of selfishness. In even the best ideals that have

been so far held up before the minds of youth, one of the leading characteristics is distinction. I think I am safe in saying that nearly every one who purposely does great good to society acts from a composite motive, made up of a desire to distinguish himself, coupled with a desire that others may be benefited. The former is selfish, the latter unselfish. The idea of distinction has all along made so strong an impress upon the minds of many that they come to regard it as necessary to their individuality. A desire to be distinguished above our fellows is but selfish vanity, but an abnormal form of selfishness that brings us no real enjoyment and more often reacts in the disapproval of others than in their coveted approval. Yet this desire for distinction has served a good purpose in society in the centuries past. It has been, and still is, exactly suited to the hitherto undeveloped and partially developed condition of man.

Man finds his greatest enjoyment in harmony. He admires and honors those who have produced the greatest harmony for his enjoyment. Society admires and accords great honors to a great military hero who produces a degree of harmony of action that enables his army to break and destroy the harmony of the enemy. We admire the great musician who produces harmony of sound; the artist who produces harmony of form and color; the great statesman who produces harmony among those of his own nation, and the great philanthropic diplomat who promotes harmony among the nations. We admire and honor great writers and speakers who are able to produce harmony of thought; we honor and admire all those who have done great good to humanity, because in so doing they have done much for the promotion of harmony in the world.

In the early stages of civilization the great leader was indispensable. The people were generally ignorant; they could not act in concert with a common intelligence, for none existed. There must be decisive commands issued by a great leader and implicit obedience by all followers. This was the only way to protect the people from themselves, and prevent their devouring each other. The leader was generally tyrannical, but tyranny was better than anarchy. As man has advanced in civilization, he has come to act more and more from an ever increasing common intelligence, and to depend less and less upon the direction of great leaders. And when the world becomes fully civilized the great leader will have sunk into insignificance, while the common intelligence will have become the great directing force by which harmonious action will be preserved.

Then, conditions will be changed; influences will be

changed. Then, the best ideals of life will not encourage a selfish longing for distinction and a selfish vanity in those who have acquired it; but instead, they will be such as will appeal to each one to strive to fit himself to perform intelligently his part in the great living, moving machine of civilization, so that each and all may be individually and collectively benefited. The motto will then be "each for all and all for each." Mr. Bellamy's picture represents all as putting forth equal effort and receiving equal wages; and he was particular to avoid all inequalities in wages, by providing to increase the hours of those having the easier places and reducing the hours of those doing the harder work. While the equality idea is very attractive to me, yet possibly liberty may demand that those who desire to work more than the standard amount may be permitted to do so, and receive proportionately more, while those preferring to work less, may be allowed to and receive less, but the last part of this must be taken with considerable modification. It might be unfair to their families if they had any; while if their families received a full share it would be unfair to society. But no doubt this question will be finally settled by a generation that is far more competent to settle it right than the present.

I like the idea of equal wages for equal effort. I like it first, because it comports with the principle of brotherhood—more like a well ordered family where brotherly love reigns and one is not preferred above another. The sooner we begin, and the more fully we practice this principle, the more rapidly will we develop true brotherhood. I like it second, because it accords with the same principle of brotherhood as is enunciated and expounded by the teachings of Christianity. "For unto whomsoever much is given of him shall much be required"; "he that had gathered much had nothing over, and he that had gathered little had no lack"; and "let each seek another's and not his own good"; in other words, each is accountable according to his ability and deserves according to his effort. I like it third, because I believe that usually, talents differ mainly in kind rather than in degree, and that if the person reputed to have little talent be put to work at what he is best adapted to do, he will not generally fall so far behind the most talented as is supposed. Often the man of great managing capacity would fail for want of some particular mental trait in what is considered an insignificant work, and which is easily done by one having that particular trait but who has little or no managing capacity. Question:—If each does what the other could not, and the work of each is equally necessary to society, who can say who does the greater work? Again, take the man of superior mental

endowment, who is capable of taking the helm and steering the ship of state, who, as is often the case, is inferior physically, place him beside the man of giant body and herculean strength who has little mental capacity, but who can perform physical labor that is far beyond the other's ability. Question:—If the work of each is equally indispensable, which does the greater work?

"Oh," you say, "the brainy man of course; he does the work that so few can do." Yes, that sounds all right as the world goes now; but let us remember that Socialism is a science; that the Socialist nation will be conducted on scientific principles; and let us not forget that the people under Socialism will be much better educated than now, so that most of them will understand well the science of Socialism; that the administration of the public function, though enlarged in its scope, will be much simpler, so that very likely there will be millions of people in the United States, able to perform well the work of the highest places in the nation. And besides, let us not forget that the performance of disagreeable work deserves great remuneration and that under Socialism the physical work requiring the least skill will be generally the most disagreeable and the most avoided, and therefore would be, strictly speaking, entitled to the highest wages; but sound policy might perhaps forbid it, in order to encourage the unskilled to try to become skilled.

Fourth, I like the idea of equal wages for equal effort, because, under Socialism, all those doing work requiring skill will owe the public for their training. All will receive a general education at public expense, probably continuing to a certain age; then, those whose examinations show their incapacity for any kind of skilled labor, and those who prefer, will be assigned to unskilled labor, which will probably be a very small field, while the others of the same age will go into special training for shorter or longer periods, depending upon the nature of the work they expect to do. The training of some will last but a short time, probably a few months, while others, physicians for instance, will require several years. The time of service of each one will begin when he begins his special training, so that the whole expense, time included, will be borne by the public, that is to say he will begin to draw wages when he enters upon such special training. We must admit, however, that the case will stand somewhat differently during the formative period of Socialism. At the beginning, some will have acquired skill by their own industry and perseverance and that will be a reason for some inequality at first.

Fifth, I like it because it accords perfectly with the insur-

ance idea of society that Socialism proposes to practice, of insuring each member of society against all misfortune whatsoever. It is a misfortune to have less than the average ability; and if for this reason, the labor of some is worth more than that of others, who should pay the insurance for this misfortune, but those whose ability is above the average. Equal wages would exactly settle the whole account.

Sixth, I like this method because inequality of wages would tend to cause more or less caste, corruption and tyranny, depending on the extent of such inequality, which would breed more or less irritation. Of course, if the inequality should be small as it would have to be, to be at all in accordance with the proposition of Socialism, these evil tendencies will be but slight. On the other hand, equality in wages would obviate these evils. There would be a better, a more brotherly feeling. There would be far less encouragement to ostentation, which almost invariably produces one of two results; either an irritability which is unpleasant, or a servility which is degrading. In former times, and to some extent yet, monarchs delighted in parading before their subjects with great ostentation in food, dress, liveried servants, equipages, etc. The people caught the same spirit and carried it each to the extent of his ability. We now smile at their folly, for we recognize ostentation as the stamp of ignorant selfishness, and congratulate ourselves for having learned better. Now we consider it in better taste and prefer to be dressed somewhat like other people. But there is still a considerable amount of ostentation in the world of one kind and another and will continue to be while there remains ignorance and selfishness to prompt it and opportunity for its expression. When this opportunity is no longer afforded, and when ignorance is dispelled by the glowing light of truth, selfishness will decrease until there comes about a healthier sentiment, so that those of superior endowments will regard it as in bad taste for them to accept additional remuneration, any use of which would be considered ostentatious. They would spurn to accept the proffered enjoyment of any of the good things of life which their brothers, while putting forth the same effort, are forbidden to enjoy. If there should be any lurking selfishness left, it would find expression in its higher form of desire for the honor and esteem of his fellows. The crown of laurel would be his highest ambition in this direction. Permit me to say in passing, that the very highest selfish motive by which one may be actuated is found in the maxim that "he benefits himself most who strives most to benefit others." The next step brings him to that entirely unselfish motive which Christianity emphasizes, of doing

good to others out of a pure brotherly desire for their welfare, without regard to any benefit of any kind whatsoever that he himself may receive. It will require a long time, probably hundreds, and possibly thousands of years under Socialism, for the main body of society to attain to such a degree of perfection. If some of my readers think it impossible of attainment, we will not quarrel about that; but I will say, that in this is found the highest ideal of Christianity, which finds its genuine expression in that pure and simple word, love, and that I have pursued this line of thought in order to show how well Socialism is adapted to promote the realization of the ideals of Christianity; and I call your attention further to the fact, that their realization is impossible under our present system. Socialism would furnish the good and honest heart, the soil in which Christianity may grow and flourish and bud and blossom, and bring forth fruit, while you have only to look about you to see that the tendency of our present system is to furnish the bad and dishonest heart. Socialism therefore, is perfectly adapted to promote the growth of pure Christianity, is perfectly practicable for that purpose, while for the same purpose, capitalism having the continual tendency to corrupt, uproot and choke out Christianity, is utterly impracticable.

With equal wages, the only difference that could tend to form society into classes (excepting what is produced by racial difference) are moral and intellectual qualities, and these in each case, would depend largely on how the person spends his leisure time.

But, after all said in favor of equal wages for equal effort, as we have already mentioned, it is not absolutely necessary to the success of Socialism. That is to say, Socialism inaugurated with a small inequality would be fairly successful. I am inclined to the opinion that it will start this way, though I have but little doubt that the question will finally be settled in favor of equality. I know how unfavorably the equal wages idea seems to strike many people. Our present environment controls our thought on this point to so great an extent that I doubt if the majority would vote for the proposition to pay equal wages for equal effort; and I should not be surprised if a large majority of those who vote in the co-operative commonwealth vote against equal wages and instead continue for a considerable time, probably until the thoroughly trained new generation comes in, possibly longer, with some inequality in wages.

For myself, I must confess that although the equality idea contained in this proposition has from the first been very pleasing to me, and though I have been inclined to favor it

as a matter of good policy, I have all along had some doubt, and it was not till I took the time to analyze the proposition carefully, that I became thoroughly convinced of its soundness. When the people vote to inaugurate Socialism, it will be at least partially for the purpose of getting rid of some of the inequalities of our present system; and we may be sure that they will not provide very great inequalities in the new system. All the essential features of Socialism would exist, and it would be far more practicable than the present system, as a means of promoting the general welfare.

Distribution of Populations.

One of the most gratifying results of Socialism will be the scattering out of the congested city populations and bringing together the country populations into a closer communication with the rest of the world. There will no longer be the five cent fare that now compels so many thousands to pay exorbitant rents for their small quarters in filthy tenements at long distances from their work. While it would still be advantageous to live somewhere in the vicinity of one's work, the facilities for travel will be so improved and cheapened by the adoption of system and large scale methods that it would no longer be necessary to sacrifice health by living in the midst of unwholesome surroundings; and if necessary, labor to be performed in unhealthful places could be done by those living at long distances. If not enough volunteered for the work in the less desirable parts of the country, and too many in the more desirable parts, then, the amount of work would be varied till the proper balance is reached, but as the tastes and preferences of people concerning climate differ so widely, it would, I think, result practically in each family being able to live in the climate of its own choosing.

The Race Question. Socialism recognizes the fact that all the people of the earth have a natural right to all the earth; that if the Japanese, the Chinese and the Hindoos are so overcrowded in their own country that they can no longer gain a subsistence, it is their perfect moral right to go into other parts of the world where they can. But Socialism also recognizes reason, not only in its construction, but also in its introduction; recognizes the fact that we must begin with man as he is and move forward as we can, keeping the general welfare in view. Since the Socialist movement is a movement along political lines and the many nations are politically independent, the movement in each nation must be more or less independent. Here in the United States of America,

when we go before the people with the Socialistic proposition, we must put it in practicable tangible form, something that they can take hold of, must at least outline a course of political policy that could be pursued by the American people as a separate nation. One of the first things would be to consider the condition of the outside world. If some of the other nations had already adopted Socialism, our attitude toward and dealings with them would no doubt be quite different from our attitude and dealings with those who had not. We must keep continually in view, the general welfare. When we begin the establishment of Socialism, the important chief objective point will be success. The importance of this point will be emphasized if we should be the first to adopt Socialism. The world would be interested, deeply interested, in our experiment. We could not afford to make unnecessary mistakes. So then if our adoption should start such a rush to our shores from other nations as would seriously handicap our work, it would be our manifest duty to at once cut off immigration, not only Asiatic but perhaps also European. And this would be to the interest of the people excluded as well as to ourselves. As to the Orientals, it would probably be a good thing for ourselves and a great benefit to the Japanese, if we would sell or give them the Philipines. The Chinese are adapted to a warm climate and the great commercial nations could, if they would, open for their relief, a number of new warm countries that are not well adapted to white settlement. But there is not likely to be much done in this direction while the civilized governments are capitalistic. Capitalism cares little for her own poor, much less for the heathen Chinese. When all the great nations become Socialistic, it will be easy to distribute the populations of the earth satisfactorily. There would be no reason under Socialism for keeping any human beings crowded together like rats and preventing their rising to self respecting manhood. There is still a great abundance of room for the present population of the earth and when science, which is probably yet in its infancy becomes further developed, the resources of even crowded China may be sufficient to produce an abundance for several times its present population. Under Socialism it could easily be arranged if so desired, for the various races to live separately in separate nations, separate provinces, separate states, separate countries or parts of countries, or even separate portions of the same city if there should continue to be cities. There would be little occasion for friction and race hatred. Socialism is perfectly adapted to furnishing a peaceful and satisfactory solution of the distribution of all the races and peoples over the earth. Socialism would do

away with wars. "The nations would learn war no more." Would "Beat their swords into plow shares and their spears into pruning hooks." On this point Socialism is practicable, while capitalism has continually generated race prejudice and race hatred, prevented the proper distribution of the world's population, stirred up strife, and pitted the workers of the various countries against each other in devastating wars which have drenched the earth with blood. It goes without saying, that on this point capitalism has proven a total failure and is therefore utterly impracticable. Capitalism corrupts society in all its phases, social, political, educational and religious. It throws over truth in all its departments a veil through which it is very difficult to distinguish it from falsehood. Yes, we see that capitalism fails as a promoter of honesty, and promotes dishonesty instead. It fails as a promoter of purity of any sort, and promotes corruption of all sorts. It fails as a promoter of knowledge and truth, and promotes ignorance and falsehood. So then we see that capitalism fails utterly at every important point.

Whatever good may have been accomplished by capitalism in the past, it has run its course. It has become a dead thing in the road to progress. It was the trust that killed it. It has become a trustified fossil. Heretofore it has brought both blessing and cursing. It has now passed the point where the blessings began to decrease and the cursings to increase. There is no ground for hope that it will be otherwise under capitalism than that conditions will continue to grow worse.

CHAPTER XV.

INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION.

We now continue the showing process in a brief consideration of the various departments of life in the Socialistic commonwealth. We have been trying to present to the imagination a bird's-eye view of the whole field of Socialism in action; let us now pass through the various departments of this great field of activity and take a number of snap shots at close range.

Industrial administration may be classified into three great departments, viz.: Production of Raw Material, Manufacture, and Transportation.

Raw Material.

Mining. Since gold and silver would probably no longer be used for money, and the amount now in use as such would

be sufficient for a long time to supply the need of it for other purposes, the mining of these metals might perhaps mostly cease for a time, unless they could be exchanged for necessities produced by the people of other countries that have not adopted Socialism. If the administration could procure in this way articles which the people want with less labor than to let the mines lie idle and produce them directly, it would be the proper thing to do; but in either case all the time that is now spent in mining metals for money purposes would, under Socialism be saved and applied elsewhere to lessen the burden of each one who labors in the production of necessities.

Mining of all sorts, gold, silver, copper, iron, lead, coal, etc., is now nearly all conducted by companies, mostly by great companies. Most of these have more or less organization and method in their work. Socialism will reorganize them under one system and management and will adopt larger scale methods and larger machinery. Is there any reason why the same men with a unified and systematic organization should not be able to carry the work forward even more successfully than before? If not, Socialism would be more practicable than capitalism in mining.

Money. Under Socialism there will be little or no use for money. The financial dealings of each person, being all, or nearly all, with the public will probably be conducted by book account. The standard hour's work, or day's work will probably become the standard for measuring all values. If money should be used, it will probably be of paper exclusively. It will be much cheaper and more convenient than metal money. The intrinsic value sticklers who object to legal tender paper money now, cannot object to it then, since it will be based upon the most unerring and steady of all intrinsic values, the labor time check.

Lumbering and Fishing. These, like mining, are important industries that gather raw materials from the great store house of nature. They also are handled by great companies and the forces that now operate them might continue the work more successfully because of more thorough, systematic and unified organization.

Agriculture, the only other important raw material producing industry, will, for convenience, be considered in a separate chapter.

Manufacture.

This is already a very extensive branch of industry, and is continually becoming wider in its scope.

Under this head will be considered all work which, either by machinery or by hand, transforms the raw material into the finished product or passes it to a stage nearer the finished product. Under Socialism nearly all this work will be done by machinery.

Manufacturing includes, First, all buildings of all kinds, cars, boats, ships, docks, public works, streets, sidewalks, roads, railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, pipe lines, etc.

It only requires the application of great machinery, such as a Socialist administration could easily bring into requisition, to make use of manufacturing processes already invented and reduce the cost of building to a small fraction of what it is now. The roofs and sides of houses, flues, ceilings of rooms, etc., will probably be turned out in large sections by great machines, so that the work of erection will be a mere breakfast spell compared with what it is now. Immense machines will greatly reduce the cost of roads, railroads and nearly all the items in the list.

Science in all the industries will be much more cheaply and systematically applied than now. The great manufacturers now employ corps of scientific experts, being very careful to keep secret from their competitors the results of their experiments, in order that they may be able to produce more cheaply and undersell them in the market. As it is now, many expensive experiments are no doubt repeated over and over many times by independent companies, where then, one will suffice.

And let us not forget that while at present every man that is displaced by a machine or scientific improvement, discovery or device, helps to swell the army of the suffering unemployed and sharpen the competition that tends to reduce the wages of all the workers, under Socialism each man so displaced will help to lighten the burden of all the workers.

Machinery. The manufacture of machinery has become a great industry. It now includes not only machines great and small for doing a very large part of the work in all the industries, but also great machines for the manufacture of other machines. Under Socialism the scale of operation will be so enlarged that far greater machines of all sorts, doing much more work to the number of men employed, will do with less human effort not only all the work now done by machinery, but also nearly all the work now done by hand. There is no reason why the government could not consolidate this branch of the manufacturing industry under one management, the men keeping their places mostly at first till the improvements could be introduced, and go right on successfully.

Furniture and Clothing. The above remarks concerning consolidated organization, larger machinery, larger scale methods and economy of human effort apply with equal force in the manufacture of all kinds of furniture and clothing; for most clothing will then be made by machinery.

Food Products. Most foods require various processes of preparation of the raw product before it is ready for use. Among these is included cooking, and for convenience we extend it to include dish washing. At present nearly all this is done by woman's hand work. Some machines have already been introduced, among which are machines for making and baking bread, pies and cakes, and for washing dishes. Such inventions can now only be used profitably in great public houses, but under Socialism there would be no reason why this work should not all be done at great central kitchens and the food sent all warm and steaming in folded tables, by rail or pneumatic tube, to all the people in the vicinity. Perhaps the women may say this is too good to believe. But look at the proposition. Can you think of any reason under the sun why it could not be realized? Is there any except "It never has been done?" But wait! Let us not leave this point too hastily.

And now come ye matrons and ye maids; come and take a look at the kitchen, the mussy kitchen with its pots and pans and kettles, its coal hod, scattered kindling and catch-all wood box. Now take a peep into the littered pantry, shudder at the milk that must be thrown out, or at other articles upset by the cat or polluted by contact with the filthy mouse trap; then turn again to the kitchen, the woman's bastille of all ages. Stop and sigh, but not too loud. The sound of your own voice may startle you, for you may be mostly alone in your imprisonment and not much accustomed to the sound of human voices. "Yes, there is the floor

That yester morn was scoured so bright,
And see it now, it's like a fright."

If you utter this or some other rhyme it will probably be purely accidental and not because your mind is in a rhythmical mood. "But accidents will happen," you say. "Yes, and there is that horde of breakfast dishes, dinner dishes, supper dishes, to-day, to-morrow, next day and so on, and on and on and on and on."

And all this drudgery may be done with perhaps a tithe of the work, by using system, machinery and large scale methods. This, however, expresses but a part of the emancipation that lies in store for woman, but, seems to me, it ought

to be enough to induce every woman in the land to enlist in the cause of Socialism, if she could by any means be made to understand how much it means to her. "The rich," you say. Yes, I suppose I must except some women of wealth, but even amid the allurements and corruptions of plutocratic society I think the heart of woman could be relied on to intercede in behalf of her enslaved sisters, if only she could be undeceived as to the practicability of Socialism. There is the rub, however, for woman has generally been easily deceived, since the day that the serpent talked with mother Eve.

Water, Light and Heat. If the reader will stop and think here, it will probably enlighten him more than anything I can write. Nearly all know more or less of how these are procured in the cities. You know somewhat of the extortion that usually attends the private ownership of these and of the graft that is likely to be connected with public ownership under our present system, but for which there would be no temptation nor opportunity under Socialism. You know of the impure and disease producing water that is often furnished because it is cheaper. You know that private corporations conduct these for all that the traffic will bear, and that wherever capitalism touches them under public management it taps them for all there is in it.

You know that even with capitalism exacting tribute at every point, as it does, there is now an advantage in using furnace heat of the various kinds wherever it can be done on a large scale. You also know how expensive it is for a small plant to furnish heat for one family. Think then, how the case would stand under Socialism; with no private ownership to charge all the traffic will bear, and no capitalism to tap public ownership at a hidden point and graft on its private pipe line, but with the government in full possession of all the industries and of all resources and materials so as to provide the greatest economy in cost, and with an administration having no other interest to conserve than to follow the motto, "maximum of efficiency and minimum of cost."

Think how much cheaper the government, using large scale methods in collecting raw materials, in manufacturing, in transportation etc., could furnish heat from a common furnace to a large number of private families. Think of all these things and ask yourself the question, "Is this part of Socialism practicable?"

Transportation, Communication and Travel.

This is a very important as well as very extensive branch of industry. It is, however, probably but yet in its infancy and will be greatly developed under Socialism, so that our present facilities will compare as a pigmy beside a giant.

Government ownership and management of facilities for transportation and communication is not a new thing under the sun. It is no longer an experiment, at least not in any practical sense although some insist that it is, and that we ought to try the experiment of government ownership on a small scale but doubt the wisdom of our acting on the experiments of other countries for fear that different conditions in this country might cause a different result. But if we should try the experiment on a small scale, we might with the same propriety fear that conditions in other parts of the country might cause a different result. The fact is such a course is entirely unprogressive and impracticable. We do not proceed in that way in the ordinary affairs of life. We do not generally stop to try an experiment, but apply reason to the experience of others and go right on determined to succeed.

After most of the civilized nations of the earth have tried government ownership and have all succeeded, it would be decidedly un-American for us to hesitate in fear of failure. Is this America, bold, fearless, proud and progressive? America that led the world? And doth she now crouch in fear? Is she about to become the laughing stock of the nations? With all its openings for graft and tendency toward paternalism the government ownership experiments of the world seem to have proven successful, or at least far better than private corporations charging all the traffic will bear. The same may be said of municipal ownership. Wherever public ownership reduces rates without reducing wages of employees, no doubt the people at the bottom are benefited somewhat, but for the most part it is rather a division of the booty among the small exploiters, instead of among the great capitalists. Like all social reform measures, about the most that can be expected of government and municipal ownership of railways is to do something toward preventing the building up of great fortunes to swallow the smaller ones. The condition of the class at the bottom is not affected much except in having a larger number of masters to serve. The point I make is that public ownership has been proven successful for the class having charge of it.

But government ownership of railroads with nearly all other industries in private hands, and mostly of great cor-

porations, is a very different thing from Socialism in which the government will not be handicapped by the corporate ownership of other forms of wealth and by a bonded indebtedness in favor of great moneyed kings. Under Socialism there will be no opportunity for graft nor incentive to paternalism. Transportation will be our strong fort. It will be the key to success in all other industries, for many materials that are superior for building and other purposes that are now practically cut out of the question by high rates of transportation will then come into general use. The new regime will bring practically every man's door to the railroad, by settling the people along the passenger lines.

In educational work, the railways will be used by pupils in attending school, wherever it is more convenient, fares not being thought of. Even now in New Zealand school children are carried free. There will be a greater number of youth seeking a higher education, and consequently colleges will be multiplied, so that nearly all college students may board at home without any considerable cost or inconvenience, though they could board away almost as cheaply. Travel will be so cheapened by system and the great volume of it, and all the people will be so well able to afford it, that it will undoubtedly increase many fold. Farmers will live in the villages like other people, and travel to and from their work by rail. Much of the now useless work of the cities will be dispensed with, and at all events the people of the congested portions that now breed so much of disease both moral and physical, will be scattered out along electric lines, and if our great industries should remain concentrated in our great cities somewhat as they are now, the people will need to be scattered out so far in order to provide for their best health and the development of the children that many will have to travel long distances, adding greatly to the total volume of travel.

But this brings us to one of the points of doubt concerning the total volume of both travel and transportation. I apprehend that there will come a scattering out of industrial institutions that will tend to reduce somewhat the volume of travel and make a great reduction in the volume of freight transportation. It would probably be impossible to even approximate the extent to which this will proceed, but as sure as effect follows cause, the industries will be greatly distributed. The cohesive forces that now cause all the various industries and businesses to huddle closely together will cease and be replaced by diffusive forces. For several reasons nearly all the manufacturing industries are now crowded together into the great cities. Chief among these are, First, the fact that capital gets more labor corraled there making it

cheaper. Second, the advertising advantage of the most public places so as to catch the personal attention of the most people, and Third, the advantage of being where supplies and repairs may be had by personal purchase without the delay of ordering, waiting, paying an exorbitant transportation charge, and then the piece doesn't fit or is not the thing wanted.

Under Socialism the first two of these would melt entirely away, while the last would dwindle into insignificance. There would be no need of the purchaser making personal inspection. In fact he would not be a purchaser but an employee, agent or official of that department of the government, and would simply order what he needed of the agent or official at the other end of the line, who could have no incentive for "soaking" him with a bogus article. There would be no delay in important cases, the cost of transportation would be little more to the government than the work of handling, and it would fit. Uncle Sam's machinery would be intended to fit. It would not be changed every little while as machinery generally is now, so that a broken wheel of an otherwise good machine could not be replaced except by a whole new machine.

Yes, Socialism would wipe out practically all the cohesive forces that now draws our population together into great congested centers, and the diffusive forces, the necessity for more room for factories, the saving in distance travelled by workmen, and last but not least, the great necessities that will be fully recognized then, but are little considered now, the necessities of pure air and wholesome surroundings for the workmen and their families, these will gradually distribute the manufacturing plants out through the country, till each great industry has its own village or cluster of villages or widely spread out little city or town.

And so the great city as we know it to-day will go. The city with its medley of rich and poor; of palaces and hovels; of luxury and want; of churches with their spires pointing up to heaven, and saloons and "red lights" with their influences dragging down to hell; the city with its institutions of learning on the one hand, and its jails and police courts on the other; the city with its fashion, its learning, its culture, its preachers, scholars, scientists, artists and poets on the one hand, and its poverty, squalor, ignorance and rudeness, and its gamblers, beggars, confidence men, cutthroats, bums and pickpockets on the other; the city with its big stock market manipulators at the top, and its tin horn gamblers at the bottom; with its great franchise grabber having commodious apartments in an upper story (take the elevator), and its little pawn shop skinner oc-

cupying the show window (**Bargains! Bargains!**) next the street; the city with its great store houses bursting with all the necessities, yea, and the luxuries of life on the one hand, and on the other with its slums and tenement houses reeking with filth and vice and crime and poverty and misery and degradation; the city with its mixture of virtue and vice, (mostly vice), with its conglomeration of goodness and wickedness, (mostly wickedness), the great city as we know it to-day must in due time become a thing of the past.

Nor will the diffusive forces be content with simply spreading out into the immediately surrounding country. They will do much more than this; and here comes in the point of reduction of freight transportation.

Largely on account of the cheap labor, nearly all of our manufacturing is done on the east of the Mississippi River and mostly well toward the Atlantic seaboard. Many articles are shipped to the Western prairies and across the Rocky Mountains thousands of miles, and the products of farm, orchard and pasture are returned, while much of this vast region excels in climate, the cereals, fruits, vegetables, timber, fish and minerals. No doubt there will be a considerable shifting of population so that much of the carrying back and forth will be saved. This would be an immense saving when we consider the vast quantities of wheat, corn, oats, hay, vegetables, fruit, beef, pork, lumber etc., going east and of machinery and other manufactured articles going west. However, the greater supplies of hard wood, iron ore and coal may perhaps, keep most of the manufacturing in the East for a long time.

The increased use of concrete for building materials will probably also greatly economize transportation, for in most cases rock is not far to seek and the buildings are much more durable than those of wood.

If electricity should displace coal and wood for heating purposes it will furnish another considerable reduction in the volume of freight tonnage.

There are numerous points of economy in freight transportation which Socialism will introduce, and among these will be a more methodical use of cars so as not to have them standing idle so much of the time waiting to be loaded or unloaded at starting point or destination, or through delays in transit. With the through lines double tracked there would be little occasion for delay. So, then, the increase in the volume of business will not require so great an increase in the number of cars, nor in the number of business buildings.

But notwithstanding the influences we have mentioned that will tend to greatly reduce the volume of freight trans-

portation, yet there are other influences which it seems to me cannot fail to produce on the whole a vast increase in the volume. If Socialism proves the success we confidently expect it to, the masses of the people will consume much more per capita.

When we consider the immense quantities of fruit that would be consumed if all the people had all they wanted, and the ease with which it is produced in the Pacific States and in the South, we cannot fail to recognize that it would do a great deal toward increasing the volume of our transportation. And if our own country is unable to furnish an abundance of tropical and semi-tropical productions, our government could arrange a wholesale exchange with the nations on our southern border, till oranges, figs, lemons, dates, bananas, guavas, pineapples and cocoanuts would become as common and plentiful in every home as potatoes.

But perhaps the greatest increase in the volume of transportation will be in the increased use of building materials. As we have already seen, the use of concrete, which is more durable and made from materials that are, in the majority of cases nearer at hand than lumber, will tend to reduce the volume of transportation, but its much greater weight will tend to increase it. Then if the people are well able to afford it, they will want a far greater quantity than is used now, and will on an average be much more particular about the quality than now. I say this confidently, for I do not believe, as some seem to think, that the making it easy for all to afford good houses nicely finished and furnished will cause the people to go back to living in caves and hollow trees. Being once loaded, it will cost the government but little more to move a train load of rock one hundred miles than five miles, so that within reasonable limits distance will not usually cut so much figure as quality.

Another use which the government will make of the roads and which is now mostly cut out by excessive rates, is distributing feed to live stock, or the stock to the feed. As it is now, a drought or hard winter often make feed so scarce in some parts that stock suffer and starve, while reverse conditions together with other influences makes a superabundance in other parts. Often a man having a few stock and no money to buy feed that is shipped in at a high price, rather than sell part of his stock at a sacrifice, (for no one will buy except at a very low figure so as to make a big profit), takes chances on their starving till some do starve, while one hundred or one thousand miles away there is feed and perhaps green grass going to waste. This, of course, belongs with the Department of Agriculture, but I mention it here to show the

increased volume of transportation and how much more useful the railroads will be under Socialism.

Water transportation will also be organized and conducted as a part of the same general department.

Like the other industries we have treated, at the inauguration of Socialism most of the men now employed in the work of transportation could remain in their places till the department is thoroughly organized.

Since private ownership and management of railways has proven a practical success for the owners when fighting each other and a far greater success for them when they combine; since governments owned and controlled by great capitalists have owned and managed them so as to make it a practical success for its controlling class, and since governments under the control of the smaller capitalist class have and are owning and managing railroads so as to make them a success to those in control, in spite of the necessity of watching like hawks to prevent some of their own number from getting an undue advantage over the rest and sitting up nights to keep the great capitalists from grafting at the hidden places, why could not all the people constituting one great equally interested body of workers, with no bone of contention, no temptation to dishonesty, no incentive nor opportunity for graft, make it a success for themselves, the whole people?

Distribution. Mr. Bellamy's plan strikes me as about as nearly perfect on this point as can be imagined—the great central warehouses for keeping goods of all kinds; the sample stores where the people may go to put in their orders; making their selections on the information given on the tag attached to each sample article, the tag being the stamp of the government and giving all the information that they would care to have, and the clerks having no temptation whatever to misrepresent the goods, it making no odds to them whether one takes them or not.

The distribution to the people of large and bulky articles will be very likely done by motor wagons or cars, while most of the distribution will be by pneumatic tube or closed electric small railway lines, in either case, arranged so that boxes may be sent through, the man at the station despatching, switching and returning them by the manipulation of electric buttons. A small part of the great army of merchants, shopmen, clerks, etc., now engaged in the work of distribution, would be sufficient to do that work then, leaving the remainder to reinforce and make easier for all, the work in other industries.

This closes the list of all the industries besides Agricul-

ture. In the last of these Socialism will make its best showing in economy of work, and nearly all the work of the others is conducted now on a large enough scale to require more or less of organization. Most of it is under the immediate supervision of paid managers. I see no reason why these should not continue under Socialism doing the same work with the same forces of men, excepting that there would then be no pressure from private owners bawling out profits! profits! more profits! and this would certainly be more than offset by doubling or tripling the number of workers, unless human nature turns out to be far less reliable than it has shown itself in the past. And besides this there is the further economy of new and larger machinery and larger scale and more scientific methods.

As to reliability, the experience of all ages since the dawn of history, has shown that men with common aims and under the pressure of a great necessity, can be relied upon to stand shoulder to shoulder, inspired by the thought that all depends on each doing his part, and that being so inspired they have, where necessary, put forth herculean efforts and have accomplished wonders.

Socialism would present such a unity of aim backed by a common necessity, the greatest and most pressing imaginable, that of sustaining the lives of a great nation. Nor is this all. Experience has also shown that the more enlightened, the more reliable they are. Then with all the economies that Socialism will furnish, tripling our working force, multiplying machinery and introducing system and science, we are forced to one of two conclusions; either that Socialism will be successful, or that civilization is moving backward and that mankind is becoming less enlightened.

CHAPTER XVI.

AGRICULTURE.

For convenience we include under this head the cultivation and management of the garden, orchard and pasture, as well as of the field.

This is regarded as the great stronghold of the objector to Socialism. However you may be able to round him up on any or all other points, he often closes the argument by a sudden, sweeping side stroke, saying, "Oh, well, Socialism is impracticable; for it can never be successfully applied to agriculture." Even so learned a scholar as Professor Ely who wrote much that favored Socialism, said that no feasible

method had yet been suggested for socializing agriculture, and stated that reports of "Bonanza farming" seemed to be adverse. (But Ely wrote this twelve or fifteen years ago.)

To all objectors I throw down the gauntlet here and now; for I claim this as my stronghold. I am a farmer myself; and while I do not pretend to know all nor even much about farming, yet I have studied at close range for many years the subject of Socialism as related to agriculture. While my information on other topics is nearly all second hand, and mostly by reading, on this it is first hand, by actual observation, or at least, acquired by being on the ground.

And while I have not come in contact with the biggest "Bonanza farming," yet I have lived in a county whose county seat claims to be the greatest primary wheat receiving station in the world, and where several sections (square miles) of land under one management is quite common, the number of sections, I think, in some cases reaching eight or ten. This I suppose would be regarded in the East as "Bonanza farming," although we hardly think of it as such out here. I have also had good opportunity to observe stock raising, both on range and pasture.

In order to get a thorough understanding of this subject we must examine its several phases separately.

I. Inclination of the Farmer. In the past, the farmer, by reason of his environment, has usually had a strong preference for working to himself, but a great change in his environment is producing a rapid change in his disposition. Formerly, with his simple tools, each farmer usually worked alone or a very small number of the same family worked together with occasionally one or two hired men. The tools were so simple that there was little or no advantage in working in groups.

Now, all is changed. To use the new machinery so as to derive the greatest benefit requires men in groups and often of considerable numbers. He must use the new appliances or fall behind in the race, and this necessity is educating him out of his old inclination to work alone. If this had continued to any considerable extent, it would have been some impediment to the introduction of Socialism. Now, this would not be much of an obstacle, and by the time the great body of the people in other industries are ready for Socialism, it will have vanished nearly altogether, and, as a rule, the farmer will be found marching in the army of progress.

There may be some exceptions among the small farmers but whatever difficulties may be threatened by these, as we have already explained, will probably be cured by a little delay in getting ready to apply scientific and large scale methods, during which, by an arrangement with the adminis-

tration, the small farmers may go on somewhat in the old way, the former allowing them for their products what seems to be just, which it is reasonable to suppose will be much better for them than as it is now, being compelled to take the price offered by the trust who has the market cornered; then, by the time the government is ready to take over the small farms, they will doubtless be very willing to exchange their farms for the better paying positions in the public service.

2. Individualistic Methods. I have no doubt that a Socialist government will introduce large scale methods in agriculture and stock husbandry, such as has scarcely been dreamed of; but if it should not, what is there to hinder the farming being continued somewhat as it is now, each farmer being paid as above mentioned and being held accountable for results, which are expected to be proportional to his resources?

I have no doubt that some will put in the objection that this would necessitate such a large corps of inspectors. Yes, this is a very strong reason for governmental management and the application of large scale methods, but not much of an argument against Socialism, when we consider the trust manipulation by which the farmer is now exploited. Many times better would it be to employ even one-half as inspectors while the other half worked and make a fair division of product, than have two-thirds idle or doing unnecessary work, as it is now, part of the idlers taking the lion's share, and, in many cases, leaving little more than a mere dog's living for the worker.

Whether Socialism conducts the work of agriculture on a small scale or a large scale, the same regulations that govern the selection of employment in other industries may easily be applied to this.

In the minds of many people the whole question of Socialism turns on its practicability; its practicability turns on the practicability of Socialistic farming, and this last depends on the practicability of conducting Socialistic farming on a large scale; but this is all a mistake. As we have seen, it does not so depend. It could be arranged for each farmer who desires, to keep what land he can work, the government paying him what its judges consider just, with a very little or no governmental inspection. Almost any arrangement at all Socialistic, would be better than the wholesale robbery and exploitation by which the trust corporations now get his raw product with so little return.

Thus it becomes clear that Socialistic management of farming with small scale methods would be far more prefer-

able, far more practicable as a means of providing for the general welfare, than farming under our present system.

This settles the question as to the practicability of the Socialistic management of farming, and with it the practicability of Socialism, for we have already found the immense advantages of Socialistic management in other industries.

Large Scale Methods. Thus the objector is ousted from his supposed great stronghold. He makes a great mistake in supposing Socialistic management of farming on a small scale impracticable, but in my opinion he makes a far greater mistake in supposing Socialistic management of farming on a large scale impracticable; for I feel confident that Socialism, by introducing system, science and large scale methods, will bring about a greater economy in farming than in any other industry except distribution.

We have already shown some of the changes that are going on in the farmer's inclinations and desires. He has been brought into closer touch with the world and has come to desire better social and educational opportunities. For this reason when Socialism is introduced, most farmers, however well they may like their work, will be very glad to exchange the old for the new economizing methods that will furnish leisure for self-improvement, and will give a hearty welcome to the village life having all the advantages of the cities and small towns, without the evils of the present ones.

Even now many farmers consider it worth while and count themselves fortunate if they are able to move to town by the time their oldest children are ready for high school, and will pinch and figure almost any way possible in order that their children may acquire a liberal education. This applies especially to the West with its great stock ranches and wheat farms.

"Bonanza Farming." To illustrate big wheat farming in what is called the "dry belt" of the Great Columbia basin, I relate here a few things that met my observation one day as I visited the farms of Mr. B. F. Berry, one of my neighbors.

At the home place a young man was "batching" and doing the chores and odd jobs, while at another place three miles away was the working "force" or "crew," consisting of seven men, one woman and a little over forty horses and mules. Five of the men with as many eight mule teams were plowing with "three bottom gang" plows, that is, each gang plow has three-fourteen inch plows. The house where they were camped was but a small box house, or "shack," while the teams were sheltered by a large tent stable that could be easily moved to the next place. Asking Mr. B. how much more he had to plow, he replied confidently that it would take

them just so many days, as there was still so many acres to plow, and they were plowing thirty-five acres per day. You will begin to realize how these farmers manage to work up to their calculations when I mention that the other two men with a team were doing some work near by that could be dropped at any time, so that if a plowman quit or got sick, the work went right on, and if a plow was broken there were several two plow gangs setting around all sharpened and ready. Besides, there were always harrows to hitch to in such cases. A small boy out here knows that big farming pays best.

Some of the larger farms still use headers, but the combined header and thresher is rapidly coming into general use. One man who has level ground told me last year that with an eighteen foot combine operated by five men and thirty-two horses, he usually heads and threshes a half section (320 acres) in about eight days. But there are new inventions already in the field and now undergoing improvements, by which it is expected that the same work will be accomplished with less than half, and possibly not over a third of the horse power.

I know of one firm that uses a traction engine for both plowing and harvesting. They find the exorbitant price of coal and the delay in getting repairs from Spokane or Portland to be the chief drawbacks, but these difficulties would be greatly alleviated under Socialism. I mention a "firm." Yes, we already have firms, and occasionally corporations engaged in farming. In the nature of the case, it is now very difficult for the farmers, especially the small ones, to unite very successfully, but it looks very much as though the time is not far off when at least the great wheat farming will be owned and conducted by the great trusts that will double up the price of bread as they now double up the price of lumber and fuel.

Electricity and Future Machinery. It has been said that we are just entering the electric age. Judging by what has already been demonstrated in this line, it seems to me no more than reasonable to expect that electricity will become the chief power used in farming. I see no reason why there may not come into use great harvesting machines run by electricity, by which wheat and other grain will be headed and threshed and moved in motor wagons without sacks to the nearest stations. If desired the straw could be baled at the same time and moved in the same way. Light electric railway lines all through the country and macadamized wagon roads would greatly facilitate this work.

Science. Agriculture has heretofore generally been re-

garded as a branch of industry in which science has little place. "Science may be all right in other branches of industry, but book farming is no good," is the verdict of the old timer. Possibly this verdict may have been justified by the failure of some "book farming" experiments in which the adage "A little learning is a dangerous thing" would be applicable.

But "book farming" has passed the experimental stage, and, in the light of recent investigations it is becoming more and more evident that science will, in the future, bring greater improvements in this than in any other branch of industry. Read the accounts of experiments of such men as Burbank and doubt this who will. Our present system does not give much encouragement to it, but under Socialism science will have full sway. And this is a strong reason, not only for Socialism but for the entire wiping out of private management, for in no other way can science be made to do its full work as by a consolidation of all under one management.

Socialism will apply science systematically at every step of agricultural and horticultural production, as well as in stock husbandry—science in soil analysis, in fertilizing, in preparing the soil by plowing, sub-soiling, harrowing, &c.; science in determining the adaptation of various soils to various crops; science in the selection of seeds, in planting and in cultivating; science in destroying pests of all kinds, animal, vegetable and insect; science in harvesting, moving crops and in preserving feed for stock, and science in breeding and feeding stock and in treating their diseases.

It seems to me well nigh impossible that any fair-minded intelligent person should consider carefully the importance of applying science in all these, the great difficulty amounting almost to impossibility of their successful application under our present individualistic system, and the evident ease with which they could be systematically applied under Socialism, and pronounce Socialism impracticable because of the impracticability of Socialistic farming.

The consideration of any of the items enumerated would furnish a good argument for Socialism, and some of them very strong ones, as for instance, Socialism would destroy weed pests by summer fallowing a whole county or more in one body, so that the seeds grown in wheat or other small grain could not blow over on an adjoining field of summer fallowed land.

The fact is that satisfactory results require a specialist in each of these items, which under our present system practically cuts science out of the question.

Individualistic Waste and Socialistic Savings. These occur in many ways, of which we mention the following:

1. Where for lack of means small farmers now often fail to carry forward work which they attempt. This occasions a great waste every year.

2. Loss of time in hunting for hired help, while laborers are elsewhere wasting time hunting for work, and sometimes a great waste by reason of failure to find help.

3. Loss of time in buying, selling and trading. Think of the time that is wasted by most farmers in this way and of the property that goes to waste because the owner doesn't know where to find a purchaser.

4. Loss of time in individual stock hunting. Now, those who turn stock into the mountains may have to spend weeks and even months in the fall, hunting among all the little ranches around the mountains; under Socialism the stock would all be partnership property, would all belong to Uncle Sam, and would be at home wherever found.

5. Loss of time in fencing. Socialism would save most of the fencing that is necessary under our present order. There would be little required excepting between farming and grazing lands, and generally small patches of the latter could be grazed at times when there is no growing crop on the former.

In all these, and especially the last, Socialism would be far more practicable, in that it would save what is now wasted. The farmer is the worst overworked and the worst exploited of all the workers, and I see no reason why, after Socialism is a little under way, it may not be arranged for farmers to work like those in other industries, in forenoon and afternoon shifts, the time gradually shortening till, as Miss Willard said, it is only "enough to give each a good physical development."

Just how rapidly this will come, however, it would be impossible to say, for the many changes that Socialism will call for will require a considerable amount of work, and there is no knowing now whether the people will adopt the policy of pushing the work with vigor or proceeding more leisurely, awaiting somewhat the developments of science and better machinery.

I believe we have now presented enough to convince any fair minded and reasonable person that capitalism has become utterly impracticable and unfit, while so far as reason goes, Socialism is exactly adapted as a means for promoting the general welfare. Just how much inspection and overseeing of work may be required under Socialism it would be impossible now to say, but it seems to me perfectly reasonable to expect that where the people are placed upon so high a plane of honor as it is clear they will be under Socialism, they will not require

much. If, however, much more inspection and oversight should be necessary than we Socialists now expect, then much more will be given. Let us not forget that society is in a pit, and the only way out is by the way of Socialism, and let us be thankful that this way is so plain and smooth and easy of ascent.

CHAPTER XVII.

PHYSICAL CULTURE UNDER SOCIALISM.

The city and the country present two extremes, the one of congestion, the other of isolation, and neither is calculated to promote man's highest development. True, the vices that infest our congested populations are the direct result of our present system rather than of the congestion itself. Even if the city populations should remain somewhat as they are the vices and crimes of our cities would not continue under Socialism, but there are other reasons why populations should neither be highly concentrated nor widely scattered, and these will now be considered among other things, under the following topics.

I. Physical Development and Health. With all the sanitary measures that Socialism could and would adopt and apply, there would still be more disease and a poorer opportunity for physical development of youth in a highly concentrated than in a diffused population. The greater liability of crowded populations to epidemics and contagions is too well known to require more than a mention, and, as we have already seen, since the means of travel and communication could be so easily afforded, and the reason for great concentration would cease, there is scarcely room for doubt that under Socialism our city populations will become greatly diffused, much to the promotion of physical health and development.

Medical Practice Under Socialism. It goes without saying that medical practice as now conducted is very unsatisfactory. With most of the people densely ignorant of the subject of health, excepting with reference to its most elementary principles, and this in many cases with those who are otherwise well informed, the people depend for health mainly on the observance of those simple rules and principles they know. (And of these nearly all are more or less, and many are very reckless.) And when a disease fastens upon them that they are unable to throw off, wear out or break up with some simple remedy, as a last resort they send for a physician of some one of the many conflicting schools, each

more or less prejudiced against the practice of the others, and having a selfish personal interest to conserve.

Of the present evils of medical practice which would be cured by Socialism we mention the following:

1. Prejudice against and opposition to other schools. From the standpoint of an onlooker we take the following view. The student at the very outset of his career begins to drink in this prejudice. He comes under the influence of those who have imbibed it before him, and whose principal interests continue to foster it in themselves, and when he comes into actual practice his own financial interest continues the process in him. Every admission of merit in any other system is but helping to tie his feet in the race; for, when called to treat a case, if he should happen to know, which generally he would not, that some other method of practice would be better in that particular case, and should so advise his patient, it would tend to turn the people toward the other method; this would occasion the displeasure of other physicians of his own school, and altogether the tendency would be to brand him with incompetence.

2. Usually the physician dares not tell a patient he does not need medicine. If he should, and should give him instructions about resting, eating, bathing, ventilation, exercising in the open air and a trip to the mountains, in probably four cases out of five, possibly nine out of ten, the patient would send next day for another doctor, insisting that he must have medicine.

3. Generally speaking, the physician dares not confess ignorance. A lawyer may admit the necessity of reading up on a particular point and nothing is thought of it, but the physician endangers his practice who does much of this, unless it be in cases that are regarded as somewhat out of his line. The young physician especially, when perplexed in diagnosing a case, hesitates before calling counsel in fear of bringing disaster to his practice, censure upon himself for incurring an unnecessary expense upon his patient and the derision of the community. Even in bad cases the doctor who always calls in counsel is apt to make the impression that he is only third or fourth rate.

All these evils work hardship on the people, and their knowledge of them tends to produce distrust of the medical profession. But there is another evil of still greater import, which is partly the direct result of those we have mentioned.

4. **Gross dishonesty and the fear of it.** Physicians are made of the same clay as other people, and all thinking persons who have any considerable experience with humanity know that some, yes, many, are grossly dishonest. Much as we may

prefer to think otherwise, our experience with the world forces us to this conclusion.

When loved ones are sick, perhaps in a strange place, or at least where there is no physician with whom we are acquainted and in whom we have confidence, something must be done. Yet the mind is filled with doubts and fears and misgivings. And, oh, how much one would give to know that the man he employs is honest. How disastrous to himself and his it might be if he is not. He may understand well the influences and temptations that beset the physician. He may be a Socialist and inclined to a charitable view, to excuse him somewhat for whatever shortcomings he may have, knowing that his environment is such that he must have been almost more than human to have been otherwise, but all this only increases his fears.

And what would Socialism do? Socialism would provide boards of physicians who would be health conservators as well. Prevention of disease would receive as much, or perhaps more, attention than remedies.

It will then be to the interest of the physician to keep the people well, instead of, as now, depending entirely on their sicknesses. All the people, physicians included, will be equally interested in any and all methods of preserving health and in all remedies for disease, without regard to the system of treatment to which it belongs. The only question will be as to whether it is successful or not.

It will be to the physician's interest to tell the truth straight out. If you don't need medicine he will tell you so, and if you are not satisfied you may appeal to higher authority.

In diagnosing a case if the doctor is at all doubtful, he will consult over the phone, and, if necessary, as in serious cases, the best medical skill will be called, and the physicians themselves would have no selfish interest in trying to deceive the people as to who is most skillful. At this point, as at all other points, to use the words of Frances Willard, Socialism will "eliminate the motives for a selfish life."

CHAPTER XVIII.

SOCIAL AND INTELLECTUAL CULTURE UNDER SOCIALISM.

Man is a social being. In order that one may attain to the highest happiness in life, and the highest usefulness in promoting the happiness of others, he must come in contact with the great pulsing, throbbing world, till his own pulse beats in

unison, till his heart is filled with brotherly sympathy that finds expression in service. Here our present isolated farm life falls short. It is true that the farmer is not excelled by any in neighborly kindness and a hearty good will for those with whom he comes in contact; none are readier to help the poor, the needy and the suffering of his neighborhood; but, as a rule, the farmer takes little interest in the outside world. He is coming to be better educated and better read, but he needs to be brought more into personal contact and fraternal fellowship with the great world about him till he realizes that there is such a world and that he is a part of it. And this Socialism will do for him, as we have already shown.

But the city life as we find it now is far more defective. With each engaged in an intense struggle for his own existence and familiar with daily scenes of suffering and want which he is powerless to relieve without great danger of falling into the same straits, the process is a hardening one, and humanity comes to seem cheap.

With the population still concentrated, Socialism would clean up the physical and moral filth, relieve suffering and obviate the cheapness, but in the matter of educating the youth there would still be a drawback. Even under Socialism, the renovated city would not be so well suited to youthful development as the pleasant village away out along the line.

The city with all its multitudinous objects and feverish excitements is disastrous to the child mind, which requires quietude and familiarity with no more objects than it can learn thoroughly; many a bud has been blighted, and many a precious young mind dwarfed by unfolding in an environment that furnishes a flurry of excitement.

With all the facilities for education and culture possessed by the cities and larger towns, it is well known that a very large per cent of our most distinguished men and women come from the country. On the other hand, while it has been pretty clearly shown that the country is better for beginning an education, yet it cannot be denied that many have been clogged and kept from rising by not having acquired that polish which comes by mingling much in refined society at the proper age. It is only in youth that habits are formed easily and well, and he who would acquire that ease, self-possession and refinement of manner that does so much in promoting one's happiness and in making him effective in doing good to others, must acquire it while young or not at all. The author knows whereof he speaks, for he has learned this by personal experience and to his sorrow.

As already shown, Socialism will bring these two

extremes together in a happy mean that will combine the advantages and eliminate the evils of both.

Under our present system most of those who acquire a liberal education stop in their advancement on general lines and turn their attention to specialties, so that, so far as general culture and education is concerned, very little further progress is ever made, and in many cases retrogression expresses it better. But under Socialism it will be different. Taking a specialty will not then mean that one must push that specialty as many hours a day as he can stand all the rest of his life, in order that he may have as big a pile of wealth as possible when he dies, or, what is more likely, that he may be able to get a decent living for himself and his family. It will not mean such a one-sided development, but it will mean an abundance of leisure, or rather time for other things besides the struggle for existence. The graduating thesis will not so often represent the acme of one's literary attainments, and the graduating class will not have to heave a sigh of regret, for they may continue right on through life gathering the glittering gems along the sea shore of the great unexplored ocean of truth.

The ideal is often held up before the student that graduation is but the beginning of an education. A very good ideal but of little worth at present, because it is generally so impossible of application, but Socialism will provide for its full realization.

But here we are confronted with the question: What is your reason for thinking that the masses will use their leisure for their own betterment, and that they will adopt the higher ideals? Why may not the tendency be to use the leisure in idleness and vice? To these we reply that civilization moves forward, not backward. Under normal conditions, and with proper encouragement, man is active rather than inert and chooses good rather than evil.

In all great movements of society, or in all great discoveries or sayings or doings of men by which society has been greatly attracted, excited or stirred to action, such excitement acts as a stimulus that awakens the minds of the people, and results in greater progress in learning and the arts generally, with a special impetus in the direction of the excitement or line of action.

For example: The discovery of America by Columbus attracted the attention of the civilized world. Among all European nations the public mind was awakened. The result was a generally increased activity in the line of the excitement—in voyage and discovery, colonization and commerce, and a general increase of geographical knowledge together with a

greatly increased dissemination of it among the people. But the activity of mind did not stop with these things. The mind, once roused, became active along other lines as well.

When Martin Luther nailed his famous Theses to the door of the church at Wittenberg he challenged the attention of the religious world. The popular mind took part. The immediate effect was a great religious awakening and break-away from time-worn fetters, and this acted as a stimulus to all branches of learning among the common people.

The American Declaration of Independence and the establishment of a "government of the people, for the people and by the people," challenged the attention of all nations. The ideals of civil liberty and the political rights of man began to be held up before the people of all nations. For a century and a quarter they have been the object of careful study, resulting in their adoption to such an extent that all the nations of Christendom have been compelled to yield more or less to the popular clamor for more liberty. Even the despotic, bureaucratic government of Russia is feeling the pressure and is now yielding, but so grudgingly, slowly and sparingly that the spectacle of another nation drenched in blood seems about to be realized.

In this educational process the people have come to love liberty and have formed a determination to have it. They are not satisfied with anything short of freedom or what appears to be freedom. And thus we see what great results came of the action of a few backwoodsmen in the far away American wilderness.

But this was not all. As the human mind was set free from the shackles of political bondage it became active along other lines, and science, invention, literature and art flourished.

And when Mrs. Stowe's story of Uncle Tom's Cabin was sent flying over the land and around the world bearing the piteous and beseeching cry of the oppressed bondman, and when later the emancipation proclamation broke the fetters from four million black slaves, men were set to studying anew the ideals of liberty, and the result was that the ideals were broadened, deepened and enlarged so as to include and define more perfectly personal freedom and individual right. And again there was an impetus given to all lines of thought and activity, and science, invention and industry took a bound forward as never before.

Thus we see that all these great changes of society were powerful stimulants of thought and industrial activity. They were followed by periods of greater intelligence, enterprise and progress. In no case did the wheels of progress turn

backward. In no case did the new thoughts put men to sleep.

Now we have the Uncle Tom's Cabin story modernized and brought down to date in stories of tenement house, packing house and child labor; of trust robberies, monstrosities and abnormalities; of capitalistic conspiracies, Pinkerton atrocities and of many other forms of oppression. Books, magazines and weekly and daily papers are sent flying all over our land and around the world. And these modern Uncle Tom's Cabins also carry with them the cry of the oppressed bondman.

But it is a different cry from that heard a half century ago. That came from ignorant, helpless people crouching and cowering before the lash: this comes from an intelligent, powerful and rapidly multiplying army of men with ballots in their hands, who thought they were free but have discovered that what they thought was freedom was but a delusive light. That was a pitiful cry from those who were conscious only of their own weakness, accompanied by an imploring for mercy: this is a cry of defiance from those who are conscious of all the strength of a vigorous manhood, that is being rapidly united and cemented into a compact and effective force, accompanied by a demand for justice; and this in a tone that shows that they mean to have it. And one of these days a new Emancipation Proclamation will be issued in this country and the shackles will fall from eighty million slaves, white and black, and simultaneously with this, or nearly so, the same thing will occur in nearly all the civilized nations of the world.

Again the ideals of liberty have been brought up before the public for another overhauling. It has been discovered that they are defective, as applied in actual practice, by reason of not being based on fundamentals; that while the "general welfare" and "equal rights" are recognized in word, as very important, yet those words become as "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal" in the face of the fact that there is no equal opportunity.

The revised, or rather the purified ideals of liberty, divested of all the old, time-worn appendages of past civilizations, and based upon the three solid rocks of human welfare, equal ownership of the earth and equal opportunity to use its resources is now being held up before the people who are very rapidly adopting them; and when, a little further on the great body of the people are ready, the old civilization will be thrown aside, and, with these new ideals of liberty before us, by methods already devised, we will begin and

build a new civilization in which these pure ideals may be fully realized.

This is a great world-movement, beside which all other movements of society pale into insignificance. Even now it has assumed immense proportions, but what will it be when we come to make the transition from capitalism to Socialism? Imagine, if you can, the immensity of the change. If the discovery of an unknown coast in the fifteenth century, the bold action of an obscure monk in the sixteenth, the desperate determination of a few backwoodsmen in the eighteenth and the freeing of a few million black slaves in the nineteenth, if each of these in its own time was so effectual in waking up mind, and constituted such an impetus in all lines of activity, what will be the effect when the civilized nations usher in the co-operative commonwealth? What do you think, dear reader? Would the effect be to put the human race to sleep? Do you think that man would begin to crawfish—go backward through all the stages of past civilization till he finds himself a beast of prey in a cavern, surrounded by the skulls of his victims? He wouldn't have to back very far, provided he passed through Wall street, Broadway or some such places, especially No. 26 Broadway, to find the beast of prey with victims scattered everywhere.

But here comes someone running and yelling at the top of his voice. What is he saying? Listen. **"No incentive! No Incentive!! NO INCEN-N-N-NTIVE!!!"**

This no incentive argument is a very fine looking pet. It is such a pretty beast, that I almost regret to interrupt it, and yet, when I think of the harm it is doing I am filled with a desire to flay and dissect it and show what it is made of.

On account of the ignorance, shiftlessness or improvidence of a part of the people, it has no doubt often been well in the past that there was an incentive that was sufficient to prompt another part to lay up more than they needed for their own use, but in these days of labor saving machinery when it is easy to produce an abundance for all, such incentive is, to say the most of it, not so much needed.

It is difficult to tell what is good in such a hap-hazard hit-and-miss, topsy-turvy system, or rather, lack of system, but waiving the question as to whether it is needed or not, under the competitive system, the matter stands practically thus: Every time one gets more than his share of the capital another gets less. To illustrate, A and B both have small farms adjoining each other. Each requires \$500 to support his family. Each raises potatoes. When each raises one thousand sacks, the price is fifty cents per sack and each has a living. Next year A becomes ambitious and raises three

thousand sacks. This reduces the price to thirty cents. So B is short two hundred dollars, which he borrows of A and A has two hundred dollars more which he loans to others. They go on this way for a few years until B is compelled to sell his farm. So A buys it and has two farms while B has none. Then B continues to live on the farm and afterward continues to pay rent to A for the use of it.

So we find that this pet called incentive, innocent as he appears and innocent, intentionally, as A is in keeping him, is, after all, a pesky robber that has brought about B's enslavement to A. This is a simple illustration, but it shows how untold millions have been enslaved.

The process is generally more complicated, but the same principle operates in buying or selling. If the money that A loans to other parties had been put into the market for the purchase of other articles which B needed, it might have raised the price and B's living would have cost more than \$500.

The best we can make of it competition is gambling, an all hands round game, in which the weak or unlucky are continually falling, while part or all the others are gaining what they lose. It is disastrous when all play fair, but now that the trusts have entered the game with their "tricks" an honest man doesn't stand the ghost of a chance.

One trouble now is, that those who respond too little to incentive fall behind in the race and sink into a position in which they are required to work harder for a poorer living. That is to say, the incentive becomes less, while the need of it becomes greater. There can be no doubt that this fact alone has discouraged millions and sent them forth as tramps and vagabonds, who if it had been otherwise, would have remained useful and respectable citizens. Under Socialism this evil will not occur. The incentive offered each one will be the full product of his labor, and not only the full product, but the many times, or at least several times greater product which the economies of Socialism will furnish.

Thus Socialism will furnish a far greater incentive to those who are weak in responding to incentive. If the present nine hour wage or two or three times that amount should be held up before one of these weak ones and he called on to do three hours' work for it, do you think that the three hours' work would be as great an obstacle to the drawing power of the wage as nine hours? Now don't evade the question by saying that some would not do even three hours' work. That is not the question at all. It is not how lazy some men are, but it is which will furnish the stronger incentive to those of this class, Socialism or capitalism?

But what will Socialism do for the more ambitious, those who respond too easily to incentive? It will offer them the same greatly increased incentive until their wants are all supplied, but will not permit them to accumulate piles of wealth that shall be a menace to the welfare of other people. In a nation that constitutes a great insurance company, that protects against misfortune, and incapacity of every kind whatsoever, when enough has been produced by all to supply the wants of all for a safe distance into the future, it would be foolish to desire to accumulate more. Such a desire would be abnormal—just as much so as the appetite that prompts one to eat far beyond what is necessary.

The incentives of Socialism will be far more satisfactory in ordinary cases than at present. They will be all that will be needed. There will be less physical labor required and practically no individual business to manage; hence much more leisure, and this together with the influence of the great change in waking up mind can hardly fail to bring a period of higher intellectual culture.

As to public spirit, ambition and inventive genius, we will say that public spirit is now, and always has been a strong factor in the world, in spite of the fact that it is continually clogged and crippled, crowded out and smothered by selfish interests and necessities. What may we not expect of it when these obstacles are removed?

As to inventive genius, we insert here a quotation from A. M. Dewey in "The Ideal Republic," pp. 24-27.

"Why should ambition or inventive genius be stifled by the guarantee of comfort and plenty which is proposed in the Co-operative Commonwealth? As well assume that the great artist who produces an Angelus while living in comfort, surrounded by conditions which inspire the best that is in a human soul, would have produced a better picture had he lived in a garret with hunger and abject poverty for his daily companions, while wife and children cried for bread. This might be true were money the only inspiration to effort. But who ever heard of an inventor, a painter, a sculptor or a composer of music or verse who found his or her greatest inspiration in the hope of a financial reward? Can any one point to a great achievement which promoted the welfare of the human family which was so inspired? Does any one suppose for a moment that Napoleon, Washington, Lafayette, Grant, Lincoln, Phillips, Dewey or Schley were inspired to heroic effort by the hope of monetary reward? Did any man or woman ever perform an act of heroism or sacrifice for money alone? If they did, the writer does not know of it. * * *

"How does the inventor fare to-day under the system of competition. * * * There are more than one thousand patents issued by the patent office each week in the year; yet the number of men who have realized a competence for themselves from their efforts can be counted on the fingers of the two hands. Singer made a fortune by mulcting the people in the price of his machine. Elias Howe died comparatively poor. Morse ditto. Watt, Stevenson and Fulton were also poor men at the

time of their death. The inventor of the block signal system, in use on many railroads, died in a mad house, crazed because no corporation could be induced to try his invention, and after his death several railroads adopted it at once as the very best possible device to avoid rear end collisions on double track roads.

* * * * * *

"Edison, than whom no man ever achieved greater success as an inventor, is a comparatively poor man. But his inventions have electrified the world, theoretically and actually and he will live in history after the owners of the product of his genius will have been forgotten with their death.

"And so it is with the inventors of the cotton gin, the power loom, the rotary pump, the compressed air drill, and many other of the most useful products of the brain of man. The men whose genius has brought civilization and order out of barbarism and chaos are not the men who have profited by the effort. To-day the inventor is recognized as a public benefactor to just the extent that it is possible to skin him for the benefit and profit of some individual, firm or corporation. Under Socialism the inventor would himself reap the full reward of his effort, and be given a place in the Hall of Fame just in proportion as his invention was of value to society. Do you not think there would be in such a system sufficient incentive to stimulate every man or woman to their best efforts?"

Space forbids or we might add many pages showing the disappointments and neglect suffered by inventors, and the injustice heaped upon them by the sheer hoggishness of corporate greed.

Socialism is already producing a great mental awakening. The Socialist Party has a literature all its own, and at once scientific, rich, and glowing with the love of humanity. Much of this is already recognized as standard everywhere, while no other political party has ever had a literature worth preserving.

This awakening process must continue to affect more and more people, and when the great change occurs, the better opportunity, the leisure time, will be seized eagerly by a very large proportion of the people and used in mental culture and the acquirement of knowledge. Education will then begin in earnest. It will be counted a thing worth while and will go forward relieved of many of the trammels which greed now interposes.

The objects and ideals of education will be made to conform with the ideals of the new civilization. There is reason to hope that Socialism will eliminate nearly all the vanity and superficiality that still clings to our educational work, in spite of all the efforts of educators to avoid them. They result from two influences: In the first place, our whole civilization is permeated with vanity which is a form of selfishness lying at the foundation. What wonder, then, that we so often find the student more concerned about appearing well, than in doing actual work. I believe that the purer educational ideals under Socialism will inspire the youth with

less of the desire to outshine and more of the desire to make the most possible of one's self.

The second influence which causes superficiality, is the mad rush for wealth—the desire to get through as soon as possible and go into business and the estimating the value of an education in dollars and cents.

The pressure of these two influences, emanating from every home, from every shop, from every office, from every factory, from every street corner, from every moving train and from all the institutions of society, sweep like a mighty avalanche across the educational field, filling the faithful teachers with dismay and dissipating their fond dreams of thoroughness and successful mind building.

Too often now, our schools are but sweat shops in which great numbers are herded together like a flock of sheep, the individual being lost sight of in the mass, all at work, or supposed to be, dipping, skimming, tasting, here a little and there a little, all in a hurry-flurry, darting, pitching, too frequently half learning a little of everything and learning nothing well, and emerging with but one acquirement, a habit of hesitation and doubting which sends them stumbling all through life, and the teacher the worst sweated of them all.

Under the new order based on unselfishness, vanity with all other forms of selfishness will gradually wear away, and the financial estimate and sweat shop methods will find no place. Then, Mammon worship will have ceased and it will be considered worth while to give the individual the attention which he requires.

Then, the teacher's dream of thoroughness will be realized. Then, the educational work will have some solidity to it—will be a real mind building and character building. Then, there will be time for the supposed dull pupil. Then, each step will be a solid rock on which the pupil will stand firmly and from which he will step confidently and self-reliantly to the next higher step. Then, the pupil will actually learn to think. The nations will become nations of thinkers. The people will come to have real thoughts of their own and not depend so much on patent thoughts, ready made and turned out to order. This will surely be the result, for effect always follows cause.

The diffusion of our congested city populations and the better home co-operation in the educational work which must result from a continually rising scale of intelligence will greatly facilitate the work. When we come to consider education as development, the education of intellect as a learning to think and proceed intelligently in the process of training

the mind instead of pitching at it an immense confused and conglomerated mass of ideas, most of which never find a lodgment, and when the people come to be thoroughly and truly educated, then much of the best of the world's philosophy may be condensed into the great seed thoughts with mere suggestive outlines of the reasoning based upon them, and easily mastered.

Time was when knowledge was enthroned and it was said that "knowledge is power." Now, however, wealth has been crowned king and knowledge receives only a secondary allegiance, is not much spoken of except as a means of acquiring wealth: but when wealth (and by this I mean the desire for great piles of individual wealth,) has been dethroned, knowledge will again take the first place.

Yes, there is going to be a great awakening. The mind will break, is already breaking the fetters that are holding it in an abject bondage to an old time formalism, and will soar aloft with a degree of freedom hitherto unknown to the human race.

CHAPTER XIX.

MORAL INFLUENCES UNDER SOCIALISM.

But, you ask, what will be the principal field of its soaring, and what of morals under Socialism? Will the mind become purer and better by being made wiser, or will greater freedom mean greater license? To this we simply ask is it true, the old saying, that "ignorance and vice go hand in hand."

But let us turn and inquire what is the principal line of excitement in this great movement? What motive lies at the bottom? To what side of human nature does it appeal? If it were a wild, licentious whoop and hurrah, in which right and justice and purity and decency are set at naught and trampled under foot, we might have reason to fear. But instead of this we find that the opposite is true and that the Socialist movement is emphatically a great moral movement, a superlatively clean movement, a scheme by which it is proposed to eliminate most of the evils of society, many of which have hitherto been unavoidable under all the circumstances, or rather, to cast aside the old civilization with all its evils, and build a new one in which it is evident that the highest and purest ideals may be realized.

It is a proposition to put into operation a scheme of society that will for the most part eliminate crime and vice, by eliminating the causes that produce them; that will make

men honest, which they naturally incline to be under normal conditions, by removing the temptations to dishonesty; that will avoid injustice, by the removal of practically all opportunity for it; and that will actually (not theoretically) provide for the general welfare by the most systematic economizing of all the industrial forces.

Such a movement, then, must be a decidedly moral movement, and the special trend of thought that follows the great awakening may be expected to be a decidedly moral trend.

When we look over the history of the past we see plainly that man has made a great moral advancement. The fact that he still has room for improvement does not alter this. Now, since he has made any moral progress with all the discouraging, dragging down influences that have beset him, what may we not expect when for these are substituted the encouraging lifting up influences? In line with this thought we quote the words of Professor Ely, as found in *Modern Socialism* by Charles H. Vail, pp. 95-96.

"Our present system, then must be rejected as not answering the requirements of practical morality. It is thought necessary at every step to reinforce it with oaths of citizens and administrative officers, and there is nothing which so blunts the conscience as the frequent oaths in our political life.

"Our system of taxation tends to bring the morality of the community down to the level of its most unscrupulous members, and that in this way: No device known to man can enable the assessor to get at certain classes of personal property in the hands of the cunning and unscrupulous. They make false returns and their neighbors know it; the entire community, in fact, know that men of large means are not bearing their fair share of taxation; people feel that it is an iniquity to place upon them burdens which properly belong to others, and so they, too, make inadequate returns, and still the voice of conscience with meaningless quibbles.

"Another aspect of this case is presented by the facts of competition in business. Those who escape the payment of a fair share of business taxes have an advantage in business which enables them to undersell their competitors, and when a business man sees ruin staring him in the face because his dishonest neighbor makes false returns and pays taxes on only a fractional part of his property, the temptation to do likewise is almost irresistible, except for moral heroes and moral heroism cannot be made the basis of governmental action."

And let us consider before dismissing this topic that under capitalism nearly all the evils of society, nearly all the vices of man, have more or less, and in one way and another, been subsidized and become articles of merchandise, and it will be easily understood that to whatever extent these evils are caused by the mercantile motive, the greed for gain, to that extent Socialism will eradicate them; for under Socialism there will be no longer any opportunity for the exercise of such mercenary motives, for no one will be permitted to engage in any business for private profit.

One of the two principal of these evils is the liquor traffic. There are two main reasons why this traffic continues: First, because Jack wants to drink, and Second, because of a greed for gain in others.

Any one who has even a tolerable understanding of this subject knows that the second of these is by far the greater reason. This is shown by the facility with which anti-liquor bills in legislatures are defeated by the great liquor establishments. It appears in the opposition to local option in small towns, on the ground that it will drive away trade. It is seen in the saloon itself, and in all its many substitutes, including the drug store, the "pocket saloon," the "blind pig," etc.

Now, as to the first reason. Jack is not generally a very bad sort of a fellow, in fact, he is frequently very genial and often it was partly on account of his jolly good nature and amiability that he contracted the drink habit. Usually in his sober moments he realizes that it is a bad habit and would be glad to quit. To such an extent is this true that the saying that "the drunkard reforms every Monday morning," has become proverbial. But in our present society his chances against the habit are very poor. He can scarcely go anywhere on the earth, not even out to sea, without having the temptation placed before him.

The second reason for the liquor traffic is wholly financial and mercenary, and, of course, would not exist under Socialism; and as to the first, the victim of the drink habit would have every encouragement to reform. It could be arranged for him to work where he would not come in contact with the temptation. If the Keeley cure or any other proved to be effective he would be encouraged to take it.

Of course, under Socialism the people through the government, would have the power to regulate or prohibit the manufacture and dispensing of liquors, in whatever manner seemed best to them. There would be no opportunity for private persons to render the public management of no effect. Under Socialism, if a majority want prohibition they may vote for it, and it will prohibit. There will be nothing to prevent it—no drug store dodge, no pocket saloon, and the entire "blind pig" species will have become extinct.

But, I believe most Socialist writers at present favor the open windowed public dispensary, with no loafing and no treating allowed, the liquor to be drank on the spot, with the clerks wages just the same whether he sells little or much. This cannot reasonably be objected to by those who oppose prohibition on the ground of its interference with personal liberty, and it is certainly reasonable to expect that with the

elimination of the element of profit which Socialism would bring, and the encouragement to cease drinking which Socialism would furnish, it will at once dwindle into insignificance, and will shortly die out altogether.

The other of the two most important subsidized vices, is the social evil. This like the other also has two main reasons for its existence. First unbridled lust, and second, greed for gain. The latter may exist in either the victim or the one by whom she is victimized; and when in the victim, it usually, or at least very frequently, begins with the direst necessity.

It is well known and conceded on all hands, that a very large majority of the cases of prostitution are the result of money considerations to either the victim or those who work her ruin, or both—temptations which would not exist under Socialism.

Socialism would at once reduce the number to those whose downfall is wrought by lustful inclinations; and, if as we have reason to believe, Socialism brings a much higher moral plane, the number will be still further reduced. In a society where all have both opportunity and encouragement to be self-respecting, the moral influences must become greatly improved.

There is a constant struggle going on between the forces of good and evil; and as in the matter of wealth accumulation in our present society every dollar that one has becomes a power in his hands enabling him to get more, so in the Socialist society, every time an immoral influence is eliminated and a moral influence substituted for it, it will constitute so much capital gained by the forces of good, and every addition of such capital will furnish an additional impetus that will accelerate the movement. Like the accumulation of great fortunes it will roll and gather as it rolls. The contemplation of this feature of Socialism, more than any other, fills my mind with optimism concerning the future.

And it seems to me that there is little room for doubt on this point, for do we not see the same principle frequently exemplified, not only on a large scale, as in a nation, a city or a large section of country, but also on a small scale, as in a school, a neighborhood or a small town.

A particular vantage point at which this principle will operate under Socialism is found in the fact that, "the motives of a selfish life" having been eliminated, that natural human sympathy and love for his kind, which under normal conditions exists in every one, will cease to be smothered out and caused to dwindle away to nothingness. Many a man, naturally as good as the average, and even better, being educated to selfishness in our mercenary schools of finance, becomes a

betrayers of female virtue as a matter of course, with little or no compunctions of conscience, where, if he had been under an opposite environment, nothing would have been farther from him.

But we must not think that the operation of this principle is confined to the stock market gambler who hurls to ruin his thousands of victims and learns to laugh at their discomfiture. It operates in a milder form, but just as surely in its effects, among all classes of society. This looking out for number one, to the disregard of the interests and welfare of others, a thing which all are now required to practice more or less, educates to selfishness, and this selfishness, as we can easily see, cannot but increase the danger to virtue in the hour of temptation, while the presence of unselfishness is always an added safeguard.

The Family. (Modern Socialism, pp. 133-136.)

"It is sometimes suggested by the refainers of capitalism that Socialism is hostile to the family. This can hardly be called a misconception, although in charity we will list it as such. It shows that the advocates of the present order mobilize every argument, however sophistical, that can be utilized to excite popular prejudice against any system that antagonizes it. It also evidences that our friends are short of ammunition.

"As Socialism has to do solely with economic relations, the supposition is at once seen to be absurd. Socialism will, however, have many indirect bearings of vast importance, and none of more consequence than that upon woman and the conjugal relation. That both would be greatly elevated under Socialism none can doubt who are sufficiently informed to venture an impartial opinion. It is the Socialist who has called attention to the destruction of the family life due to present industrial methods. The present economic order is the direct cause of the disintegration of the family. The separation of father, mother and children in our great industrial centers is necessitated by the struggle for existence. Each must seek through his or her own efforts the necessities of life. The wage of the common laborer being insufficient to support his family, the wife and children are pressed into service and the home life is destroyed.

* * * * *

"Not only would Socialism elevate the family, but it will also elevate woman, by placing her economically upon an equal footing with man. I do not mean by this that Socialism will simply open the door of industrial employments to woman, for this is already done in most departments, and with most baneful results. In those fields open to woman competition has been fiercer, and wages so lowered that the whole family now earns but the wage formerly received by the head of the family. Such has been the result in many industries thrown open to the free competition of women with men. Socialism does not propose to increase this competition, but recognizing the physiological difference between the sexes, it would secure to woman the opportunity of suitable employment, with reward according to results. This would mean the true emancipation of woman. Instead of being dependent as now upon man for her support, she would be at liberty to earn her own livelihood. This does not imply that all women would avail themselves of this privilege, or that Socialism would encourage her in seeking this employment. The very fact that she

has the power to earn her own living would have a salutary effect. It would extirpate the thought of marriage as a 'commercial institution,' and would exterminate *in toto* the 'matrimonial market.' Were women enabled to honestly earn their own living, they would not consent to marry for a pecuniary consideration, or for anything else but love. 'The spirit of mercantilism,' says Mr. Sprague, 'has polluted the stream of love and virtue till the most sacred human relation is often made a matter of commerce.' Woman no less than man must be endowed with economic independence in order to secure perfect freedom. This does not mean that women whether married or single should as a rule earn their own livelihood, or that Socialism expects such. Socialists hold that it is the husband's province to provide for the necessities of his family, and the very fact that the new order would render it easy for a man to support a family would encourage matrimony.

"Says Lawrence Gronlund, 'It will enable every healthy adult man and woman to marry whenever they feel so inclined, without present or prospective misgivings in regard to their support or the proper education of children. Socialists are charged, ignorantly or insidiously, with attempting to destroy the family. Why, we want to enable every man and woman to form a happy family. And not only to form a happy family but to preserve one, for Socialism would remove the chief cause of divorce.' Says Professor Ely, 'The causes for divorce have been shown by the National Department of Labor at Washington to be largely economic. It is the pressure of economic wants in the lower middle class which is most fruitful of divorce.' Socialism by removing this pressure, would mitigate this growing evil which threatens the home and the perpetuity of our civilization."

Religion Under Socialism. The question naturally arises, how are churches and other institutions which all the people do not want, to be supported under Socialism? If a church, for instance, wants the services of a man as pastor and that man is enrolled in the industrial force, how can it be arranged?

The answer to this is very simple. If a church or any number of people, organized or unorganized, desire the services for a part or all his time of any member of the industrial force, they can petition the government and he will be exempt from duty for the specified time and the value of his time will be charged to the petitioners. This will apply to such preachers, lecturers, teachers, editors, authors or any others whom a part of the people desire to employ.

The idea is that it will be the business of the government to produce whatever the people want and furnish it to them at cost, whether it be the direct services of a man, papers, books, food, clothing or furniture; whether it be articles used by all the people or a part of the people.

To put it in another form, each article produced represents service. At the beginning of each year the board of statisticians will make up their estimates of the amount of services required by the people during the year. The quotient of the whole number of hours of service required divided by the whole number of workers, will be the number of hours service of each worker during the year, and this divided

by the number of working days in the year will show the number of hours per day of service for each worker.

In making up the estimate of services required as above mentioned, it will be necessary to take into account the demand for preachers, lecturers, etc., and those who support them will receive less service in other forms, in food, clothing, shelter, car fares, books etc.

All books and periodicals will be published by the government and furnished to the people at cost, but a book or paper that few use will cost more.

As to the attention given to Christianity in the period immediately following the introduction of Socialism, there can be no doubt. The intimate connection of Christianity with all moral movements and the fact that the ethics of Socialism are announced to be identical with the ethics of Christianity gives assurance that Christianity will receive much attention in that period of intellectual activity, and we may be further assured that the circumstances will be such that the truth, whatever it may prove to be, will have a much better opportunity to rise to the top.

CHAPTER XX.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

As we look over the world, we see a great struggle going on. It is not new. It is as old as civilization. It has come into distinct notice and taken definite form in this country only during the last half century. I mean what is generally known as the struggle between capital and labor, and by that, of course, is meant the struggle between the capitalist and the laborer.

On the side of capital it is claimed that capital and labor both deserve and receive equal consideration in this country, while on the other hand the labor advocates say that labor is superior to capital and is far more deserving, while not receiving so great consideration. Even so distinguished a person as Abraham Lincoln, deplored the fact that capital is placed above labor in the structure of government saying that labor is prior to and the superior of capital; that it is the creator of capital and deserves much the greater consideration.

During the past ten years this struggle has been intensifying very rapidly, and now it looms up as never before. Capital charges labor with murders, conspiracies and all the other crimes of the decalogue.

Labor charges capital with injustice, tyranny and cruelty to the employees of railway, mine and factory, especially to the women and children in their employ. Labor also charges capital with judicial murder and conspiracies to discredit and break up organized labor and bring it into disrepute in the eyes of other people; with corrupting congresses, legislatures and the courts, and many other crimes too numerous to mention.

The struggle as it is now going on, is principally between the capitalist class, and the proletarian or landless class, and more particularly that portion of it that is organized into labor unions.

Just above these is a class of small capitalists, usually called the middle class. Some of these side with the great capitalists and some with the labor unions, while many are in doubt as to where the interest of their class lies, and also as to the relative merits of the struggle viewed from a moral basis.

It seems to be generally agreed among those of both the middle and proletarian classes, that many oppressions are inflicted upon both by the great capitalists. But as to the moral status of the present struggle between organized capital and organized labor, many are very much in doubt. Many Christian people are especially perplexed at this point.

As I have not made a special study of this question, I will not undertake to give much information concerning it, but will confine myself for the most part to observations, suggestions and reasoning on generally admitted facts, hoping that I may thereby assist the reader somewhat in coming to an intelligent comprehension of the situation.

My life having been mostly spent on the frontier I have had very little personal acquaintance with either of the two contestants, and therefore, if I must admit a shortage of personal knowledge, I may, for that reason, claim some degree of freedom from personal bias.

It is a fact so well known that it is hardly worth while to mention it, that in almost every war, broil, fight or quarrel of any kind, even down to a family quarrel, there is generally more or less wrong on both sides. This is true in cases where one side is decidedly in the right and the other is decidedly in the wrong, and possibly it sometimes occurs that the party that is in the right as to the cause of the trouble is guilty of more wrong in the squabble. Viewing the matter thus, the first question that arises is, which is the right side in the great struggle? To answer this we cite the reader to the chapters on Competition, The Trust and the Justice of Socialism, in which we endeavored to show, and we think did

show, that all the great millionaire fortunes are usurpations, being the result of accumulations not always dishonest, but nevertheless always unjust, the result of the operation of an unjust system.

If, then, our conclusion is true, the capitalist side of this struggle is the wrong side and the laborer's side is the right side, for they are kept out of possession of what rightfully belongs to them. And whatever grievance other wage workers, or the middle class (many of whom are in even a worse condition than the wage worker,) may have against labor unions, the great capitalists have no just financial grievance against them—none at all unless it be of a criminal nature. And here let me repeat, that if all the crimes and all the evils charged to labor unions were proven it would be an argument in favor of Socialism, for unionism is the product of capitalism, so that its crimes whether many or few are indirectly the product of capitalism; and the greater the crimes, the greater the reason that capitalism should go and be replaced by Socialism.

But perhaps the capitalist would say that the Socialist recruits come mostly from the trade union ranks, and that there would be no use trying to inaugurate Socialism with such material; and to this we reply that in various parts of the world prosperous communities of respectable people have grown up from settlements of criminals, and, as under Socialism the temptations to commit crime would be mostly removed, there would be a greater encouragement to reform than in any of the penal settlements mentioned. But if unionism is so desperately criminal in its tendencies as the capitalists would have us believe, we would better rush the game and usher in Socialism as soon as possible, before so many have joined the unions and been debased as to make the number to be reformed exceedingly large.

Since the argument is for Socialism, whatever the case may prove to be, and since the object of this work is the discussion of Socialism, we might with propriety rest the case here; for, having determined which is the right side, it is not so very important to know which side is guilty of the most wrong in the details of the struggle. The whole struggle is a bad condition growing out of the accumulated wrongs of a defective system. What we need is to change the system. It is much more important to apply a remedy that is effective, than to ascertain all the detailed manifestations of the disease; to put an end to the wrongs than to know where to place the blame of each wrong that is committed. Nevertheless, in order to get the whole situation clearly in mind, we will continue the analysis.

What, then, of the two great parties? Who are they? What is their environment? And what are the motives that prompt the action of each?

In a general way, we may say of both parties, that they are men, all human beings, capable of all the virtues and liable to all the vices and frailties of human nature. The natural qualities of the average millionaire are probably not so very different from those of the average trade unionist—just a little more ambition, a little more acquisition, a little more cunning, and a little less brotherly sympathy, a little less conscience. In some cases there is a great difference in these, and in others a considerable difference the other way; but in the average as we have stated, there is but just a little difference of natural qualities. Whatever differences now exist result mostly from a difference in training.

First, take the millionaire. To understand the evolution of the millionaire, turn back and read, if you do not recall it, what we said of the development of the pure, unselfish and honest youth into the corrupt, selfish, dishonest, money-mad maniac. Of course most of the great capitalists will resent the accusation of dishonesty, and so, as I am not personally acquainted with them, I will presume that many of them are comparatively honest. But the world has different standards of honesty. Examining these, we find all grades from nothing up to that perfect pattern of whom it was said, "Neither was guile found in his mouth." Yes, the millionaire is made of about the same clay as other people, but his surroundings are different. The influences that govern his life are different. He looks from a different viewpoint at many of the great questions that agitate society. His glasses are colored with self-interest and set in the golden frame of vested rights. This tends to make him proud, arrogant, arbitrary and often tyrannical. There is a great distance between him and his employees. He associates chiefly with those of his own class, and like all other classes, the capitalists are not exempt from clannishness, a relic of barbarism which if we will watch for, we will see enough of among all classes to take the conceit out of us when we become vain of our very high civilization. Clannishness minimizes the faults of one's own class and magnifies those of the opposing class. Clannishness is suspicious and judges a whole class by the worst it knows or suspects in any of its members. This was illustrated by the simple minded Indian who said, "The Kentuckians are all alike, all very bad people." Clannishness often justifies or excuses the crimes of its own class, and is easily made to believe that crimes committed by them were committed by its opponents.

Going back along the line to the point of divergence between these opposing classes, let us inquire about the training of the trade unionist. What is his environment and what is its effect on him?

Well, to begin with, he usually earned his bread by the sweat of his brow. That, under a normal estimate of respectability, would be calculated to make him decidedly self-respecting; but society's estimate of respectability is decidedly abnormal. Society has come to regard as the most eminently respectable those who earn nothing themselves and are the most cunning exploiters of the labor of others; and not only this, but labor has come to be regarded as degrading.

This has had a most baleful and debasing effect upon the laborer, for he has felt most keenly the degradation. This false notion of respectability has given him a feeling of self-abasement where self-respect ought to have been. But now, trade unionism is, to some extent, leading him out of this error. He is coming to be more self-respecting, and consequently is rising in intelligence, character and self-reliance.

But along with this the trade unionist is awakening to the fact that he, along with all other toilers, is being robbed of a large part of what rightfully belongs to him. This puts him into an ugly mood. Like the wayfarer who has slept by the roadside, and, awakening misses his purse, he is liable to pick a quarrel with the first man he meets, and is apt to be more or less suspicious of nearly every one. And this feeling is not confined to the unionist. It was felt by many a farmer in the days of Populist agitation, and there are now many farmers, small merchants and other middle class people, as well as wage workers, organized and unorganized, that are being made to feel the same way by the Socialist agitation.

These influences serve to cement the trade union forces more firmly together in the bonds of fraternal comradeship. They increase the spirit of clannishness; for the unionist is clannish as well as other classes. It comes to him as a result of scenting a common danger. He also looks through glasses colored by his own self-interest; but they are set in the frame of natural rights to the extent that he understands natural rights.

And now what of the crimes charged against each other by the contending parties?

Here permit me to repeat, that among any very large number there are nearly always some who are sufficiently selfish, avaricious and wicked, to commit any crime that promises great reward. (See corollary to principle 1.) I introduce this as having a possible bearing on either or both sides in this conflict.

It is clear to any one who has studied the subject closely, that there are many great temptations besetting the great capitalists. Just what proportion of them yield I am not concerned to know; but it may be interesting to consider that the world of commerce is a great game. We are all gamblers, all who conduct any sort of business for profit—all except the wage worker. Those who play fair according to the rules of fairness, which are not very well defined and often far from being fair, are honest as the world counts honesty in our present society, honest gamblers; and those who play "tricks" are dishonest, dishonest gamblers. Now, I believe it is pretty generally understood that among common gamblers, one who plays fair stands no show against those who play "tricks." In the light of this thought, then, it would seem highly probable that nearly all those at the top have played "tricks," else they would not have gotten there, and are therefore dishonest gamblers. Yes, we are almost driven to the conclusion that those at the top are mostly corrupt; but perhaps the slackness of the rules of fairness may ease the consciences of some of them somewhat; I would like to wedge in as much charity as possible; but really there doesn't seem to be much room for charity, not much chance for ease of conscience, unless they have adopted the old saying that "all is fair in war."

Capitalism is mercenary at best, in all its manifestations, but in its more intense and concentrated forms, it is simply ruthless. All in all, it is not strange then, that our magazines and papers are filled with hair raising stories of the stock market, of the grinding up of woman and child life in factories, of peonage atrocities, railway wrecks caused by working men long hours, requiring them to rush so as to leave no time for precaution against accident, and failure of owners to keep roads in proper repair. It is not strange that mine disasters are of frequent occurrence because the owners fail to provide the proper precautions and life saving appliances. It is not strange that we read of "packing house scandals" and "insurance swindles." It is not strange that John D. Rockefeller, the boasted "Honest John," the great religio-educatio-benevolent-humanitarian has been shown up to have acquired his wealth by methods the most ruthless and unscrupulous; that instead of being an honest gambler, as he has claimed, he has been the most cunning, ruthless, and unprincipled trickster of all, which easily accounts for his having reached the top. It is not strange, now that the people are waking up, that he is planning to put them to sleep with a quarter billion dollar rock-a-bye will, which if given, will be arranged, no doubt, so that the beneficiaries will lose every time

there is water squeezed out of his stocks. It is not strange that he has already given magnificent sums to colleges, churches, missionary societies etc., closing the list with thirty-two millions to the Educational Board, while the student winks and says "It's too thin; he is trying to buy up the whole people." None of these things surprise us when we look at the matter from this point of view. The corollary we have mentioned operates all too disastrously for society.

It may not be pleasant to think of our great "Captains of industry" as mostly corrupt; and neither is it pleasant to think of society being in the power of the most knavish, but it is best to know the truth, and there can be no doubt of the tendency. The only question is as to what extent the tendency is realized in its effects. For just as sure as our commercial life is a game, which it is; and that there is opportunity to play unfairly, which there is; and that there are some who are disposed to play unfairly, which there are; just so surely is there a tendency for the unfair players, that is to say, the tricksters, the dishonest, the unprincipled, the unscrupulous, the rogues, to rise to the top. Yes, it is unpleasant to think of these things, but it is a very important, a very serious matter. It shows a pressing necessity for a change in our industrial system. We may console ourselves that every rogue at the top makes one less among those further down, but the reflection doesn't bring much comfort.

And what are the motives that chiefly prompt the actions of the trade unionist? To this we say first, that he is selfish. But then, as Ruskin says, "He need not see any particular uneasiness about that, for so is everybody else." The number of extremely selfish at the top tends, of course, to raise the average at the bottom, but the number at the top is so relatively small as compared with the numerous throng at the bottom, that it is too insignificant to be worth considering; and so when the cavilist answers everything as he usually does with one fell swoop, by saying with an air of triumph that they would all do just the same way if they had the opportunity, we say, "Yes, it is not the people but the system that is to blame." Possibly we may admit a little too much, but if the working classes had been placed in the environment of the capitalist, with the training that it would furnish, those of them who rose to the top would probably present just about the same spectacle of a "job lot" as those now at the top. It is not accurately true to say that all the middle class or all the rank and file of the wage workers would be as bad as those at the top. But that is neither here nor there. Our contention is against the system that tends to bring out

the worst that is in each individual and place all the rest of the people in bondage to a small group of the most corrupt.

The average working man is a stranger to the temptations to gross dishonesty and unscrupulous rascality which beset the great capitalist. Before he becomes a trade unionist his relation to his employer is one of servility and self-abasement. But when he enters a union that relation begins to change. It often proceeds gradually no doubt, but finally it comes to be one of self-assertion and self-respect. Socialists recognize this as the most important benefit derived from trade unions, whatever else may be said for or against them.

As already stated the trade unionist is selfish. He tries to get the most he can for himself. In order to do this he strikes. He ties up business. Sometimes the tying up brings little or no loss to the employer, as in the case where a factory has enough goods on hand to supply the market for a long time. In such a case the strike continues till the strikers are starved into submission to the employer's terms, and it serves as a lesson against striking in the future and tends to hinder the non-unionist from joining the union. When the employers see that they would lose too heavily by the "tie up" they make concessions and the work is resumed. Then the workers are said to have gained a strike. They become more bold for a future move and new recruits enter their ranks and the union takes a stride forward.

In the past there were so few unionists and so many non-unionists with which to break the strike that most strikes were lost. But recently the unions have become so strong, the tie-ups have become so serious, and it has become so much more difficult to "break the strike" that it is now a much more serious thing to the employers. The most serious feature of the whole matter, from the capitalist standpoint, is the fact that when the striker fails, he is easily led into the thought of striking at the ballot box, the thing that the capitalist most fears and dreads. Socialists, however, recognize in this the key to his final triumph.

The unorganized worker complains, the capitalist or his emissary often putting the complaint into his mouth, that while the striker has a perfect right to refuse to work he has no right whatever to prevent anyone else from working by intimidation or force. But the employer comes in and enjoins him from using even persuasion and reason. As a result of these contentions it is not strange if on both sides many things are done that ought not to be done. Knowing that the press of the country with few exceptions is in league with capital, and that every act of violence on the part of the strikers will be magnified in the eyes of the people and made to appear

against them in its most flagrant light, the union leaders usually use every effort in their power to restrain the men from violence of all kinds, especially such as endangers life or works great damage to property. And it would be very strange indeed if reckless, hot headed, unauthorized members should not at times be found breaking over all restraints. Not having had opportunity to observe and not caring to investigate in detail, I take it for granted that there have been many such cases, and possibly there have been cases where leaders were indiscreet in this respect. But knowing the tactics of their opponents, who take advantage of every little slip to bring them into disrepute before the unorganized workers and the great middle class whom they are desirous of arraying against them, it seems to me preposterous to suppose that it would be the settled policy of great organizations to walk deliberately into the net that is set for them.

The unionists in reply to the non-unionists' complaint, say that they themselves were sacrificing more than the strike breakers gained in a struggle which, if successful, would make conditions better for themselves directly, and indirectly better for the non-unionists; that the action of the strike breakers paralyzed all their efforts, and that if the non-unionists would join with themselves the result would be greatly improved conditions for all the workers.

The middle class people, especially the farmers, also lodge a complaint against the unionists. They admit the justice of the unionists' claims as against the great capitalists, but complain that after he gets the lion's share nothing is left for themselves. To which the unionist replies "Form unions of your own and strike for your rights."

"But," returns the farmer, "that sounds all well enough. We have often talked of farmers' trusts, but the trouble is we are dependent on so many other trusts that are backed by all the power of wealth in the hands of the robbers at the top. We might strike for higher prices for our produce, but they would offset our action and bleed us through the banking trust, the railroad trust, the machinery trust, the warehouse trust, the sack trust, the twine trust, and the packing house trust etc."

"Then," continues the unionist, "you would better give up your small business, which could be conducted much more profitably on a larger scale, enter the ranks with us, and we will all strike together for the rights of all."

Socialism recognizes the potency of this argument from the unionist, but insists on the utter foolishness of stopping

with anything short of a complete dethronement of the robbers at the top.

No doubt the action of the labor unions sometimes works a hardship on the old who are living upon the accumulations of former years, on the farmer class especially, and possibly on the small mercantile classes. The big capitalists take advantage of this and seek to array these classes against the trade unionists. And so their emissaries pass around among the people patting the farmer and the small merchant on the back and saying, "You are a capitalist, same as the rest of us. You ought to belong to our Employers' Association." But if they are wise they will not be caught by such cajoleries; for they should know that so long as the robbers at the top are in power there can be nothing for the farmer but fleecings, and nothing for the small dealer but to be crowded out by a branch house of a great corporation.

Next let us consider briefly a few of the great struggles between organized capital and organized labor. In nearly all these there is more or less crime or malicious mischief committed. As before intimated, capitalists have been accused of committing these, or hiring it done, for the purpose of charging it to the unions and bringing them into disrepute. Evidently this might often be profitable to them, and it would be comparatively easy, because of the small number of capitalists interested, and where part of them are too honorable, the interest of one or a very few who are corrupt would often be sufficient incentive.

Labor Troubles in the West. In the Rocky Mountain states a battle royal has been waged for several years. The contending parties are the Mine Owners' Association, a well defined organization having branches in all the quartz mining states, and strengthened by the backing of the smelter trust, confronted by the Western Federation of Miners, organized in 1893 with 2,000 members and now 60,000 strong.

The latter have conducted a considerable number of strikes, among which was the famous Coeur d'Alene strike of 1899 in northern Idaho. Here the bull pen was first introduced in the West. Some miners were accused of destroying property. They retorted saying that the mine owners themselves, through the Pinkertons, destroyed some almost worthless property for the purpose of charging it to the strikers. The mine owners applied to Governor Frank Steunenberg for assistance, who in turn called on the National Government for troops. General Merriam with a force of negro soldiers was sent in response, and the miners' organization was destroyed by force. Using the language of George H. Shoaf, "More than a thousand men were rounded up like cattle, and

herded into an open plain, where, surrounded by human harpies, they were subjected to a brutal persecution such as Andersonville and Libby never knew."

In 1903, in the Cripple Creek district, San Miguel County, Colorado, occurred the last great strike. The miners claim that it was not desired by either the officers or members of the Western Federation of Miners, but that it was forced upon them by the Mine Owners' Association, who were determined to destroy the union as they had done in Idaho.

A little before this movement, the Western Federation of Miners had, in their general convention, adopted the principles of International Socialism. It spent money for the education of its members in the new political faith, and its leaders, especially Moyer, Haywood and the members of the Executive Council, became bold and fearless advocates of this new doctrine of industrial emancipation. This progressive policy made it superior to any labor organization in the world; and this, it is claimed, together with the defiant attitude of its leaders, determined the Mine Owners' Association to exterminate the Western Federation of Miners root and branch.

Our limited space forbids the rehearsal of so long a story which has been given at length by George H. Shoaf and other writers through the Socialist papers, and corroborated by "Report of the Labor Troubles in Colorado," made by Labor Commissioner Carroll D. Wright, a copy of which I have before me, and I wish that every reader would procure one and examine it thoroughly; and please remember that Mr. Wright is a Republican and that you are not getting from his report simply the Socialist version. Space forbids more than a brief comment, but let us observe a few important points:

The various parties that figured in the recent Colorado strike troubles, were, 1, the union miners; 2, the non-union miners; 3, the mine owners and smelters; 4, the Citizens' Alliance; 5, the Pinkertons, and 6, the Governor and military.

It is well to consider here the various viewpoints and motives of these several parties.

The principal parties in the struggle were the union miners, principally the Western Federation of Miners, on the one side, and the Mine Owners' Association on the other. The interests of these two classes were directly opposed to each other. The mine owners were in it for profit and regarded it as their right to get labor as cheaply as possible. The miners on the other hand, claimed the right to get the highest possible wage. The mine owners' and smelters' claim of benevolence is, on the face of it, about as hypocriti-

cal as the oily speeches that fall from the lips of plutocratic orators in which it is asserted that "the interests of capital and labor are identical." Take the following from Wright's report page 139:

"On July 5, Manager Guiterman issued to the public a statement from which the following extracts are taken:

"Speaking for this company, I desire to say that it has at all times had the interests of its employees at heart, and that it has hitherto spared no expense by and through which the sanitary, operating conditions at its various plants could be improved and the nature of the work lightened."

If it is really true that a great corporation had the interests of its employees at heart, it was certainly a new thing under the sun.

The other three classes mentioned were, for the most part, subject to the Mine Owners' Association. We will now consider what seems to me the most important factor bearing upon the views, motives and finally upon the actions of these several parties, especially the union miners, mine owners and Citizens' Alliance. That factor is Socialism.

1. **The Influence of Socialism on the Western Federation of Miners.** In the struggle between capital and labor the latter usually admits the right of the former to a "fair profit;" but just what constitutes a fair profit often comes in as a bone of contention; and besides, labor has come to question the reported profits of capital. But Socialism teaches that the laborer is entitled to the full product of his toil. This cuts all profit entirely out of the question. As early as 1902, Socialism became a ruling force in the Western Federation of Miners. And so the miners began to talk its principles in connection with their struggle with the mine owners for a larger share of the product. They began to talk of their moral right to the whole product, and expressed their intention of continuing the struggle till they should get it. This, of course, does not mean that those who have labored in the production of the capital shall be left out of consideration, but, of course, this is the construction which the opponents of Socialism put upon it and worked for all it was worth. And here the struggle began in earnest. Strictly speaking the miners were right. The moral principle that the laborer is entitled to the full product of his toil is just as true under capitalism as it will be under Socialism. We cannot blame the unionist, but in reality, when he insists on the application of this Socialistic principle in the settlement between him and his employer, he is but sewing new cloth on an old garment and we must not think strange if the "rent is made worse." The fact is the capitalistic garment is so woefully rotten that any attempt at patchwork, especially when the

patch is of a radically moral nature, must generally result disastrously. The more I study the subject the more I become convinced that the best plan is to carry forward the work of education as rapidly as possible till a majority favor Socialism, and then make the transition at once.

Capitalism must have profits and cannot exist without them. Any elimination of profits means the elimination of capitalism, and in the nature of the case, this must be a national affair. If under capitalism all profits should be suddenly cut off, then, practically all wage production would cease, and before it could start forward, there would have to be a change of possession and management. The advocacy of Socialism by the Western Federation of Miners set the pot to boiling.

2. **The Influence of Socialism on the Mine Owners and Smelters.** The effect on these could be nothing but that of alarm, coupled with a determination not to be beaten. No doubt most of these, perhaps nearly all of them, are too aristocratic to imbibe Socialistic principles and are disposed to regard Socialism as a dangerous enemy. Even if they understand the righteousness of Socialism, like nearly all those possessed of great wealth they are too much intoxicated by its possession to be willing to yield the power it gives. They set to work among the middle class citizens.

3. **The Influence of Socialism on Those Who Became Members of the Citizen's Alliance.** No doubt there were many of these who would have taken well toward Socialism if it had been properly and honestly presented; but this was not to be. Here was an opportunity for the opponents of Socialism to present it in a distorted form. The customs of society have so deeply ground into the minds of all holders of private property the principle of "vested rights," that we are apt to cling to it, even after we have reasoned ourselves out of it. "Is not this mine? Did I not work for it? Manage, buy and sell, trade, save my earnings and my profits? Was it not all made honestly and legitimately, and have I not the right to do as I please with my own, to conduct my own business as I please? Must I submit to the dictation of those who, perhaps, have squandered their substance in riotous living, or have been too lazy to work or too improvident to save their earnings? Shall they be permitted to come in and share equally with me in what has cost me so much pains to accumulate? Never, while I have power to resist. Why, there is neighbor A: He has worked hard all his life; now he is too old to work; but he has saved enough to enable him to own a nice little business, so that he can hire a man or two at fair wages and have a very nice living for his family; but now if

the laborer must have the 'whole product,' there is nothing but starvation for him, for he is unable to work." And thus with misrepresentation, distorted reasoning, specious argument, taking the principles of Socialism out of their proper connection and tacking them on to our present system, the whole question of Socialism with all its grand principles of justice, economy, benevolence, and moral, intellectual and social uplift, dwindles into a mere quibble, and many a would-be Socialist is turned away in disgust.

To show that the members of the Citizens' Alliance were further increased by bulldozing methods, we refer the reader to Commissioner Wright's report, pp. 49-50:

The motives of the military and the Pinkertons were mercenary. Governor Peabody and other civil and military state officials were on hand to do the bidding of those on whom they depended to keep them in office. The Pinkertons are themselves a criminal class that fatten off the crimes of others, and it is well known that they do not hesitate, when the criminal slop becomes too thin to suit them, to set about instituting methods that will produce more crime. And why should they? They are in it for what they can get out of it, and the most money is in manufacturing crime to the order of those who need it in their business and who have the money to pay for it.

In examining the Colorado situation as shown by this report I am just a little surprised at the criminal daring and cheekiness of the plutocratic forces in the struggle. My surprise is not great. I am not at all surprised at the mere fact that crime has been committed by those high in authority, for I know that one of the effects of capitalism is to keep a large force trained ready to commit any crime that offers a sufficient reward to pay for the risk. I have studied the tendency of the criminal element to rise to the top financially. I understand how easy a prey are the civil governments, both national and state, to those plutocratic vultures. I also have some understanding of the ease with which those in control of the "powers that be" may make use of those powers in reducing to the minimum, the risks of committing crime. I, therefore, am not at all surprised at the mere fact of crime in these quarters, but I am a little surprised at the shameless brazenness with which the mine owners, supported by the civil and military authorities, conducted their infamous campaign of crime. I am a little surprised to find this report reading so much like mediæval history.

But there is one point indicated in this report that surprises me very much and that is the decidedly peaceful attitude of the Western Federation of Miners under the most pro-

voking and exasperating circumstances. There had been, it appears, some cases of violence among the union men prior to 1903, all of which were strongly disapproved and censured by the unions as is shown on page 91, relating to the strike at Leadville in 1897.

In 1899 there was a strike of Italians at Lake City. These were members of the Western Federation of Miners and seem to have been guilty of violations of the law, but they were forced to leave by the action of the mine owners. There was also a strike in 1901 at Telluride in which, under great provocation, there were violations of law by members of the W. F. M., which were disapproved by the union in the articles of settlement with the mining company. These violations were nothing more than might have been expected, and yet they were recognized by the unions as being disastrous to their cause. They were cautioned by the leaders, especially by President Moyer, who implored them to be very careful not to commit any acts of violence. Accordingly, after the beginning of the strike of 1903-4, the peaceable attitude of the Federation men during the long stormy period of persecution that followed, is a marvel of patient forbearance that it would be hard to duplicate. True there seems to have been a very few minor offences committed by individual members. These occurred mostly in efforts to drive away non-union men who were used in breaking the strike. In such cases the temptation of the striker to do this is very strong, and, looking from his point of view, he is apt to justify himself in doing it. There is nothing in the report, however, to indicate gross violations of the law on the part of union men, excepting in the riot that occurred at Victor just after the Independence horror, and according to the report this was caused partly by a mistake and certainly more by the fault of members of the Mine Owners' Association than by the Federation men. The attempt of their enemies to fasten upon them the responsibility of the Independence outrage failed, and to some extent reacted upon themselves. See Wright's Report, pp. 247-53; also pp. 253-6.

It seems to me that any one who reads this report carefully and impartially can hardly help agreeing with William D. Haywood, who in answer to the mouthings of Governor Peabody about insurrection, said that, "If the Governor would go and hang himself the principal insurgent would be dead."

The confession of H. H. McKinney shows the role which the Pinkertons played. It is said that they were so thick and so busily engaged in spying on the unions that in one instance two of them, each unknown to the other, having worked their way into the union and been appointed as organizers, were

each watching the other, thinking the other a genuine union man. It was a rich and promising field for the detective. All that was needed was a few skillfully planned and executed murders of the first magnitude, excitement and party feeling would do the rest. Considering all the circumstances I think it even more likely that the murder of Manager Collins was a detective intrigue than that it was the act of some one of the many unionists whom he had exasperated by his unjust and high handed measures.

Whatever the reader may think of this Colorado situation generally, there are three very important points which, it seems to me, must be clear to every thinking person. These are:

1. That the whole trouble is a natural product of our present economic system.

2. That this report does not indicate that the Western Federation of Miners' leaders in general, nor Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone, in particular, adopted a criminal policy; but in fact it shows the opposite. The situation as here revealed shows clearly that such a policy would be very foolish on their part, and a rehearsal of the facts shows that they so recognized it and that in this respect they were not indiscreet.

3. That the fear of and opposition to the principles of Socialism was the main impelling motive that prompted the Mine Owners' Association and the Citizens' Alliance in their criminal action, and that the whole affair of 1903-4 was principally a persecution of the Western Federation of Miners because of their Socialistic tenets. In proof of this we cite the reader to Commissioner Wright's report; pp. 41-42, 49-50, 291-2, 328-9; and from these we quote briefly as follows:

"However, the operators have had no negotiations whatever with the Federation, nor will they unless unionism, and not Socialism, becomes the controlling consideration in that organization. We are not knowingly employing any members of the Western Federation of Miners, because we do not believe that we can afford to allow a branch of that organization to become re-established in this district while the Socialistic element in the organization continues to direct its policies."—One of the mine managers. See Wright's Reports, p. 292.

"Not only as individuals, but as an organization, the Citizens' Alliance actively supported the policy of the Mine Owners' Association of refusing employment to any member of the Western Federation of Miners, and also the policy of deporting all members of the Federation. The alliance and the association alleged that the Federation was a 'Socialistic and criminal organization,' and therefore, that their attitude toward it was justifiable."—Wright's Report, pp. 29-50.

When we examine these carefully, it is easy to see that the progress of Socialism was and is the one particular thing dreaded by the Mine Owners' Association and that they sought to divide the ranks of labor and prejudice as many as pos-

sible of all classes against Socialism, by parading before the mind all the incongruity, both apparent and real, that would result from applying its principles in our capitalistic society.

The looting of the W. F. M. Co-operative stores by the Citizens' Alliance, I think, may be taken as an additional manifestation of the opposition to Socialism; for they were certainly the result of an effort on the part of the W. F. M. to realize some of the economies of Socialism.

The next important movement in this great struggle was the unlawful kidnapping of the W. F. M. officers, Charles Moyer, President; William D. Haywood, Secretary-Treasurer; and George A. Pettibone, a member of the Executive Committee, at Denver on February 17, 1906, by the conspiracy of the officials of Idaho and Colorado, aided by Pinkerton detectives.

The crime with which they were charged was that of the murder of ex-Governor Frank Steunenberg, of Idaho, who was killed by the explosion of an infernal machine at his front yard gate in the town of Caldwell, Idaho, on the night of December 30, 1905.

The facts of this kidnapping conspiracy are too well known to require more than a mention. For more than fourteen months these men have been confined in jail, and now, as the time set for trial approaches, it is enough to make one's flesh creep, so much is it like the coiling of a snake around its victim, to read an article such as now lies before me, which is but a sample of hundreds that are paraded before the public.

This article was written from Boise, Idaho, under date of May 4, 1907, in anticipation of the approaching trial. Concerning the false affidavit by which the Federation leaders were extradited, the writer says that "though false, it is nevertheless true as a compliance with the letter and spirit of the statute according to the officers of the state."

The statement may be true "according to the officers of the state," but the trouble is they are liars when they say that the affidavit was "true as a compliance with the letter and spirit of the statute," unless it be that a statement can be false and yet true at the same time. "True as a compliance with the letter and spirit of the statute." How can that be? Oh, I see now! The lawmakers manage to jumble words together so that they may mean almost anything; and the lawbreakers just juggle the words, breathe into them whatever spirit they please; and so, when it is desired to proceed against laboring men, a false affidavit will answer the purpose, for it can be interpreted to be "true as a compliance with the letter and spirit of the statute."

I have not examined the Idaho statute, but I suppose

they must have it fixed up that way somehow. It used to be that a statement that was false, was false sure enough, and that was all there was to it. Now it is different. Now it all depends on interpretation and construction. It is wonderful what they can do these days? Wonderful! It all depends on the officials. If they understand their business they can do almost anything and it is all right. In the olden time it was taught that "the king can do no wrong;" but in our modern society the quality of infallibility extends to all officials who have in their foreheads the mark of the beast of Capitalism.

Continuing, the writer says that the result was a victory for the state. Yes, it was a victory for the party in power in Idaho. It was a decided victory for capitalism; but like many another victory recorded in history, it is apt to prove its greatest defeat. The writer of the article is surely not so ignorant as not to know that the United States Supreme Court admitted that it was a kidnapping "in defiance of all constitutional right," but held the imbecilic position that the possession of the bodies of the defendants, though illegally acquired, was legal. As to the methods of gaining possession of the defendants, the officials were black conspirators and criminals, but once in their possession, that possession was legal. This is very difficult for us to comprehend, who are not versed in interpretations and constructions and juggling of statutes. And it is not necessary that we should comprehend. All we need to know is that it can be done, and when it is done we should acquiesce quietly, like good (desirable) citizens, and not go bleating around that the prisoners were kidnapped in defiance of all constitutional right, lest we also become "undesirable" citizens.

But whatever may be the conclusion relative to the merits of the Moyer-Haywood case, it is not by any means vital to Socialism. The whole trouble, as well as all similar troubles, is the result of a defect in our present system, that argues very strongly for its abolition, provided there can be found a better system to take its place; and such a system we confidently insist has already been outlined in Socialism.

CHAPTER XXI.

GOVERNMENTAL ALIGNMENT WITH WEALTH.

And whatever one may think of the merits of the Moyer-Haywood case, so far as the actual guilt or innocence of the accused parties is concerned, it helps to illustrate a fact already well known, that nearly all our governmental machinery, both state and national, is but a tool of capitalism.

To get this well before the mind, we insert here a portion of Justice McKenna's dissenting opinion.

In the case at bar the states, through their officers, are the offenders. They, by an illegal exertion of power, deprived the accused of a constitutional right. The distinction is important to be observed. It finds expression in *Mahon vs. Justice*. But it does not need emphasizing. Kidnapping is a crime, pure and simple. It is difficult to accomplish; hazardous at every step. All of the officers of the law are supposed to be on guard against it. All of the officers of the law may be invoked against it. But how is it when the law becomes the kidnapper? When the officers of the law, using its forms and exerting its power, become abductors? This is not a distinction without a difference—another form of the crime of kidnapping distinguished only from that committed by an individual by circumstances. If a state may say to one within her borders and upon whom her process is served, I will not inquire how you came here; I must execute my laws and remit you to proceedings against those who have wronged you, may she so plead against her own offenses? May she claim that by mere physical presence within her borders an accused person is within her jurisdiction denuded of his constitutional rights, though he has been brought there by her violence?

Talk about your *Dred Scott* decisions! But why comment? This document is a commentary of itself, and ought to be framed and hung in every home, in every office, in every public hall, in every place where man doth congregate.

It presents a sectional view of our civil government. Perhaps an observation taken at this point reveals more plainly than at most other points the nature of the government and so does more toward answering the question that naturally arises in the mind of the student, as to whether our government is a democracy or a plutocracy. The observation taken here reveals very clearly the fact that it is a plutocracy; and I think it will be found that if observations taken at other points do not show this so plainly it is because they do not reveal so much; and that all they do reveal points in the same direction.

Observations made at two other simliar points reveal very different phenomena, but go to prove the same thing, namely, that is a plutocracy.

I refer first to the case that has been so well aired by the Appeal to Reason and other Socialist papers, that of ex-Governor Taylor who was charged with the murder of Goebel of Kentucky, and fled from the state after the crime was committed. A requisition for his return could be made out with a true affidavit showing him to be a fugitive from justice—no need of an Idaho prosecutor to swear to a lie.

Was the requisition honored? No. And why not? Was there any difference in the crimes charged? No. Both were the blackest of crimes—cold blooded murder. Was there any difference in the personnel of the men? Practically none. Both were men of brains, men of recognized intelligence. Was there any difference in the social standing? Not to speak of. Both

were recognized leaders among men. Why, then, was the requisition based on an affidavit known to be false honored, while that based on a true affidavit was dishonored? There must surely be a difference somewhere.

Yes, there is a difference. It is true that both are leaders of their respective classes; and this suggests the difference. The one was a rich man, a capitalist, a political advocate of capitalist politics, and affiliated with the capitalist class. The others were poor men, wage-workers, political advocates of working class politics, and affiliated with the working class.

A comparison of the phenomena revealed by these two sectional views shows conclusively that we are being plutocratically governed.

The other case is related by the Appeal to Reason as follows:

"Julius Beiser, who, being under indictment for various swindling operations, was kidnapped February 14, 1907, by Deputy Sheriff Andrew Earnest, of Lima, Ohio, and taken from Cincinnati to Allen County, where he was wanted. What happened? Federal Judge Thompson of Cincinnati (at request of the Bridge Trust, which has gone into voluntary bankruptcy to escape being held financially responsible for its swindling operations,) ordered the Sheriff to release Beiser, and cited the officer to appear before the Judge and answer a charge of contempt. This threat of Federal Judge Thompson failed to secure the release of the Bridge Trust's agent. Then what did the Federal Judge do? He wired the Sheriff as follows: 'If indictment against Beiser is nolleed you need not appear before me in contempt.' The Federal Judge, in plain words, said to the kidnapping Sheriff: 'Release your victim dismiss the charge against him, and you will not have to answer the charge of contempt.' The Judge used his position to secure the release of a man wanted in Allen County, Ohio, who, by the same tactics employed in the Moyer-Haywood case, was dragged within the jurisdiction of the court in which he has been indicted."

What the merits of this case are is of no particular value, but it furnishes another sectional view similar to the Moyer-Haywood case, in that the indicted person was brought into the jurisdiction of the court by kidnapping. The phenomena we wish to compare is the different actions of the Judges in the two cases. In the one case the Supreme Court of the United States refuses habeas corpus to the indicted persons, and in the other Federal Judge Thompson, of Cincinnati, Ohio, orders the release of the indicted person.

And again we ask, what was the difference in the two cases that caused such a difference in the actions of the two courts? Was it a difference in the courts themselves? Well, we should hardly think so. True, one is higher in authority, but a Federal Judge in a great city like Cincinnati is a man high up in authority, and we may reasonably expect his action to be not very different from that of the Supreme Court. Was it a difference in the manner of the arrest? No. Both arrests were

illegal. Both were kidnapped. The difference then, must be in the men. What was the difference in the men? we ask; and the answer comes back in thunder tones or in whispers low, it doesn't matter which, but the answer comes back; "the one ordered released was a capitalist; the others ordered held in chains, were poor workingmen." And again we have the same conclusion, that we are plutocratically governed.

Another alarmingly illustrative point in the Moyer-Haywood case is found in the illegal manner in which the arrest was made, showing to what extent officers of the law may violate the law without being held responsible. Unlawful injunctions and illegal and arbitrary exactions have become of such frequent occurrence that they have come to be taken as a matter of course, so that a Madden, an inferior officer of the Postal Department, may arbitrarily abridge the freedom of the press by unjust rulings, as he did with both Wilshire's and the Appeal to Reason, without being even questioned by his superiors. And when an official is beaten he simply retreats in good order without any reparation being made to the injured party or suffering any penalty for his violations of law however flagrant. It would require volumes to rehearse the many official violations of law in this country that are continually winked at, and in nearly all cases they are committed by the wealthy, or by those who seek to please them. Almost invariably they point to the fact that wealth rules.

But we need not confine ourselves to the consideration of sectional views. Just think for a moment of the United States Senate, that august body of millionaires. Where is the man so ignorant that he needs to be told, and who so blind that he has not seen many of them "get there." A comparison of notes shows that, allowing for exceptions and details, the story of one is the story of all.

And as we contemplate all these things there come crowding into our minds those memorable and prophetic words of the immortal Lincoln:

"Yes, we may all congratulate ourselves that this cruel war is nearing its close. It has cost a vast amount of treasure and blood. The best blood of the flower of American youth has been freely offered upon our country's altar that the nation might live. It has been indeed a trying hour for the republic; but I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country.

"As a result of the war corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands, and the republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of war. God grant that my suspicions may prove groundless."—Nov. 21, 1864, Wm. F. Elkin—Shibley, p. 282.

Mr. Lincoln said that corporations had been enthroned. Have they since been dethroned? If not they must be reigning still. And who does not know that this is the case? But they have run up against a snag at last. President Roosevelt is reported to have recently delivered himself of the following:

"Harriman and Rockefeller are backing Hearst, and I want to put Hearst, Debs, Haywood, Moyer and Harriman in the same class as anarchists and undesirable citizens. The fight is against me and my politics. It is on in Ohio, Pennsylvania and other states."

This means, of course, will have to mean that Mr. Roosevelt will have to give in and submit to a third term. That will be absolutely necessary, in order to enable him to conduct the fight to a finish. It will be a battle royal, no doubt.

To be candid, I was once an admirer of Mr. Roosevelt; not however, so ardent an admirer as some, for I had a lurking suspicion that he might possibly be just playing politics. And even with that idea in view I could hardly help admiring him still, for I thought that if it was but a play he certainly played well. For a long time during this period of doubting I had some hope that he would prove to be a really progressive man, as progressive as the people are ready for, and that he would exert an influence to lead them in the right direction. In the midst of these doubts his course has been a source of great encouragement to me, for, with the thought that he was simply playing, I was glad that it was necessary to play that way. I have long since learned to regard the sayings and doings of the politicians as an index, not so much of what they are thinking, as of what the people are thinking; and being generally too busy to keep very well posted on the trend of popular sentiment I watch the great politicians pretty closely. I use them for a political barometer or weathercock, and so when I see the politicians sneezing, I know that the people are taking snuff. Well, as time went on and the sneezing gradually became more strenuous, my doubts gradually changed to a firm conviction that it was simply a play, that finally developed into a veritable monkey show that was really amusing.

But now, it has lost even the respectability of a monkey show. The "tricks" are no longer even "cute." The fact is, the performance has become so coarse and vulgar that it is emphatically disgusting. Knowing to what extent President Roosevelt stands in the minds of the American people for a "square deal," I feel almost as if I ought to apologize for expressing myself so, especially as this is not absolutely vital to our main subject, Socialism; but it is important, as we shall endeavor to show presently.

Although a Socialist, I was inclined to regard Mr. Roose-

vult as about the right kind of a man to steer the ship of state through the shoals of the latter end of capitalism even though he might be playing politics just a little; but lately, since he has become so blatant, seems to be presuming so much upon the ignorance and credulity of the people, and is now seeking to stir up strife and animosity where there ought to be peace and good will, my disgust has deepened into indignation.

That the President's fight against the millionaires is mostly sham as shown by the way his right bower, Secretary Cortelyou, turned over \$71,000,000 the other day to the national banks in order to help Standard Oil out of a seventy million dollar gambling scrape; (space forbids its discussion here, but this matter ought to be investigated by every man in the nation;) and that whatever of his contention with the great capitalists is not sham, is but a fight over the spoils stolen from labor, the farmers' chickens, is evidenced by the following which we copy from the Chicago Daily Socialist:

"At the Gridiron Club dinner in Washington a short time ago, President Roosevelt showed his teeth and pointing his finger at H. H. Rogers and J. Pierpont Morgan, delivered himself of this gem:

"If you gentlemen are not willing to accept the action of the conservative class, which is ready to afford protection alike to the rich and poor, I will say to you now that when you have disposed of us by your machinations you will find yourselves face to face with a people which believes it has been deprived of its right and a mob which does not have the least respect for riches. You can take your choice."

Could anything be plainer? It seems to me that the curtain must have been slipped accidentally. Here is a plain proposition, the ultimatum from the hawk combination to the eagle combination. It virtually says: "You can take your choice between widening your circle and letting us in, or be turned over to the tender mercies of the Socialist mob." And, in view of the seventy-one million dollar consideration mentioned, it now looks very strongly as if the hawks, by this shrewd diplomacy had forced a compromise and have at last been admitted to the inner circle where hawks and eagles alike all sit together around a common table. It will of course be necessary to keep the curtain closely drawn except while the tournament is in progress. And this will be something grand. The exciting part about it is that the people will be made to think that it is a real fight, and many an exultant cheer will be sent up for the "plumed knight."

To show that it is not the so-called Debs-Moyer-Haywood anarchism, nor the "mob that has no respect for riches," but an organized body that "believes it has been deprived of its rights," "the real thing," the Co-operative Commonwealth, the Social Democracy that he fears, we quote here a portion of a

letter written by Jackson Tinker, a New York newspaper man, as published in the Appeal to Reason:

"Then he summoned some of the railroad presidents again and told them frankly that he was convinced they were standing in the way of their own best interests by not being willing to accept moderate regulation of railroads by Federal authority. 'Gentlemen,' he said, 'you are only inviting still more radical action—government ownership.' One of his visitors was shocked when the President, turning upon him in his abrupt manner, exclaimed: 'The Republican Party will not go up against any more "stuffed clubs" in a good while. The Democratic Party will not try that game again in this generation.'

"'What then?' gasped his visitor.

"'Social democracy,' came the astonishing rejoinder. 'That will be the next move unless we Republicans, with full power in the executive and legislative departments of the government, satisfy the people and reform existing conditions. If we don't do this we shall be overwhelmed.'"

Here is your "staunch," "bold," "fearless," "true," "impartial," "square deal" man. Dear reader: Is this the kind of square deal you want? Simply to give the people the least possible that will satisfy them and tell them how much better off they are than when they were starving? Do you want to depend on leaders who have no sympathy, nothing in common with you, no interest, in fact, but self interest, and no fear but the fear of being "overwhelmed?" Or would you prefer a government where the administration will have no incentive to give the people less than their rights, whether they ask for them or not?

Considering all these things, especially the brandishing of the "big stick" before the names of three millionaires linked with those of three workingmen, and all branded with the opprobrious name "anarchist," it becomes evident that the real fight is to be against Socialism. It is evident that instead of a "square deal," the President is determined that there shall be no square deal for labor. This is evidenced from his attitude toward the Moyer-Haywood case.

When great trials are pending it is expected of all court and other officials, especially those high in authority, that they avoid any expression that would tend to bias public sentiment. His argument that the other side do this has nothing in it. They have a right to object to kidnapping. But when we consider the President's general attitude toward the accused, as illustrated by his sending Secretary Taft to Idaho to preach "law and order" and by his bitter denunciation of them as anarchists and "undesirable citizens," when we consider this it begins to read to us that he is taking up the slogan of the conspirators, which, in an evil moment of elation and excitement found expression from the lips of Governor Gooding: "They shall never leave Idaho alive."

We insert here the following from the Spokesman-Review, a Republican paper published at Spokane, Washington:

PITTSBURG, Pa., May 8.—John D. Pringle, editor of the *Labor World* of Pittsburgh, to-night received the following letter from President Roosevelt in acknowledgment of an editorial recently published in his paper in connection with the Moyer-Haywood controversy:

"The White House, Washington, May 7, 1907.—My Dear Mr. Pringle: Nothing that has been spoken or written that I have seen of the Moyer and Haywood controversy has pleased me as much as your letter and editorial. In my letter I wished to drive a wedge in between the honest, law-abiding man—with whom I feel much hearty sympathy—and those foes of the labor movement who preach anarchy and lawlessness, just as I wish to see a wedge driven between the capitalist who is an oppressor or swindler and the capitalist who strives to do right by all his fellows—the man who is an American citizen first and capitalist second. Above all, I want to express my absolute agreement with your final paragraph, running as follows:

"The *Labor World* has not a word to utter regarding the guilt or innocence of Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone in their present terrible position. We hope they are innocent and will be proved to be so, but what we want to point out is that their innocence of the preferred charge against them will not, in our estimation, exonerate them from the charge of preaching an industrial and social policy that is damning to the best interests of the wage workers of the country."

"With all good wishes, believe me, sincerely yours,

"THEODORE ROOSEVELT."

The simple fact of the whole matter is, that the President cares very little for this Idaho case, nor even whether 'Gene Debs is an anarchist or not, but the main point that this so-called "square deal" man is driving at is to prevent Socialism getting a "square deal." He well knows that a very large part of the people are favorably minded toward Socialism. He knows that there are many of these who are Socialists—"of a type," or who are "in sympathy with the under current of Socialism," or who believe that "Socialism will come gradually and will be a great blessing to society." He knows that many of these have been deceived by the capitalist press into believing that the Western Federation of Miners are little more than an anarchistic band of outlaws. He knows that many have been made to believe that the present Socialistic movement is decidedly anarchistic; that it has "fallen into bad hands," etc. He knows that they are rapidly being undeceived, and that if something is not done, and done quickly, the time is near when all the "under currents" and upper currents, the "types" and the anti-types, the Christian Socialists and the anti-Christian Socialists, the evolutionary Socialists and the revolutionary Socialists, the "let-us-have-Socialism-quick" Socialists and the "no-use-to-be-in-a-hurry" Socialists, when all these elements will be brought together in one grand and mighty movement, in which the watchword will be FORWARD.

And there is another thing the President knows. He knows something about human nature. He knows that there is no more successful method of upsetting reason than by stirring up contention and strife, and arousing combativeness. And so

he seeks to stir up a fight with what are called radical Socialists that he may bring them into disrepute as anarchists, and wean away from them others of Socialistic proclivities.

This is the long and the short of it. It is a wily scheme of capitalism that has already begun. It is impossible to look into the future and say with any degree of accuracy what will be, but there is certainly good reason now to believe this scheme will be greatly developed. The tactics of "Royal Billy," in using terrorizing methods, by stirring labor union and Socialist leaders to words of resentment; and then, pointing the finger and crying "terrorist!" have already begun to be adopted in this country.

But whatever labor troubles there may be, whether much or little, if Mr. Roosevelt can be by any means "prevailed on" to accept a third term, we may look for another terrible four years' war, a sanguinary conflict with the great capitalists, in which the fighting will be nearly all done with the "big stick." It will probably close in time to lay plans for a fourth term.

The "big stick" by reason of its terrific momentum, will probably continue its revolutions for several months (possibly years; it cannot now be estimated) after the last foe has vanished from sight, and then all will be hushed and still.

And amid this deathlike stillness there will probably issue a new prophecy from the White House: Not like unto that old prophecy of fifty years before, filled with pessimism, with gloom and despondency, but the new prophecy will be optimistic and calculated to make one buoyant with hope. It will probably run something like this:

"The war has at last drawn to a close. It has been indeed a trying hour for ME and the Republic. It has cost a vast amount of brain and muscle and splinters. The best end of the "big stick" has been badly battered. The best portion of my brain and muscle (especially muscle) have been freely offered upon our country's altar that the nation might live, but I see in the near future a picture arising that nerves me, thrills me, fills me with ambitions that I've felt before.

"As a result of the war corporations have been dethroned and an era of purity in high places will follow, and will continue as long as there is no interference with me and my politics. This it is that sets me dreaming, 'dreaming dreams I never dared to dream before.'" Quoth the Red Raven, "Nevermore!"

To show that it is the real thing, Socialism and not "anarchy," "mob," "terrorism," "the destruction of the home," or some other imaginary, chimerical, intangible, bugaboo, we insert here an extract from an article of March 16, 1907, signed N. J. and published in the New York Journal of Commerce and

Commercial Bulletin, a plutocratic sheet of the highest authority and quoted in the Appeal to Reason:

In recent editorials you have repeatedly touched upon the subject of Socialism, and have emphasized the dangers that threaten our commonwealth from the alarming spread of Socialistic ideas. The fact remains that within recent years those tendencies have been progressing to a dangerous extent in the chief European countries. The question arises: Should we wait until the movement has attained similar proportions in the United States, or guard against it while we still have the power to do so?

I have come to the conclusion that the four suggestions given below will probably afford the best means of arresting the progress of these unhealthful excrescences on our social organizations.

That Socialism, aided by its powerful ally, the labor unions, should ever become strong enough to overthrow the laws relating to the ownership of property, which would mean a change in our constitution, may seem doubtful from present aspects; but it is by no means impossible, if we consider how often in the past the masses, when endowed with the power, have been carried away to commit excesses, and if we consider further that the masses will view matters of this nature not so much from the standpoint of equity as from that of personal advantage, especially if the end can be attained through such a seemingly legitimate means as the ballot box. To guard against such an eventuality we should enact preventive laws before the power to do so has passed out of our hands. We should make it impossible to destroy the constitutional safeguards thrown around property holders. If the constitution could be so amended that its provisions relating to the rights of the owner to his property could not be changed except by the vote of nine-tenths of all qualified electors, and if at the same time the expropriation laws were well defined and limited to the taxing power placed under reasonable restriction, we should feel assured that we were reasonably well defended against the onslaughts of Socialism.

A preventive measure, therefore, which is attainable now may not be so a few years hence.

To propose such a radical measure as an amendment to the constitution in order to guard against the aggressions of so puny a foe as Socialism is at present, may seem unwarranted to the average voter. Apparently, however, it is the only available measure within our reach. It would surely be effective, considering that the property-owning element of our population, notably the farmers, will at all times represent more than ten per cent of the country's voting strength.*

Socialism makes for peace. One of its most beneficent effects will be actual, universal peace. The ideals of Socialism are especially attractive to peace-loving people; and periods of peace are best adapted to the propagation of Socialistic doctrines, but the enemy is too cunning to permit us to conduct our Socialist agitation in a peaceable, amicable way. It is likely to be a continual fight from now on. "Gentlemen cry peace! peace! but there is no peace."

*History furnishes a very close parallel to this. In A. D. 302, the Roman plutocracy was confronted by a very similar industrial spectre to the one that now faces the modern plutocracy. This spectre was first observed by one Galerius, who appealed to the Emperors to take time by the forelock and provide while they could against majority rule. He had a program that was clear cut. It was simply to make a great slaughter and kill all the Christians. Our modern Galerius is not so practical. The first part of his program might be carried out. Possibly the people might be induced to tie their hands with the constitutional knot; but does the idiot really think there will ever be a generation so tame as to submit to a constitution that is opprobrious to nine-tenths of them?

CHAPTER XXII.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Selected Miscellanies.

Let dead hearts tarry and trade and marry,
 And trembling nurse their dreams of mirth,
 While we the living our lives are giving
 To bring the bright new world to birth.
 Come shoulder to shoulder as the earth grows older!
 The Cause spreads over land and sea;
 Now the world shaketh, and fear awaketh,
 And joy at last for thee and me.

—William Morris.

Revolutions are not destructive; they are necessary to preservation. Babes and birds grow to a certain development before birth, but cannot live forever in the womb and in the egg. Nations can attain a certain development under the capitalist system, but the social revolution must bring the necessary change at the proper time or the nation will die.—Appeal to Reason.

“CAPITALISM AND YOUR DAUGHTER.

“Dearest Mother:—It is very lonesome here and I almost wish myself at home with you. The small salary I earn each week does not dress me as well as I would like to dress; and I can't afford to buy the things I need. A gentleman came to where I was working the other day and one of the girls introduced me to him. That evening we took an automobile ride and later took dinner at a cafe. He told me he was wealthy and offered to loan me money to buy new clothes, and he says he wants me to have a good time and not be so lonely. Oh! I am so unhappy. What shall I do about it?—Your loving daughter, Jennie.”—Appeal to Reason.

“MR BRYAN AND IMMORAL MONEY.

“Unclean Money—In Washington the other evening Mr. Bryan commended churches and educational institutions which refuse to receive money dishonestly obtained. He says:

‘One of our rich men has reached a point where he sometimes finds it hard to get people to take his money. And I regard this as the best evidence of the growth of a moral sentiment in this country. It means something when a great church hesitates and refuses to accept the money until it knows how it was made. I believe the time will come when churches and colleges will refuse to go into partnership in the spending of money immorally made. The influence of the church will be a powerful factor in restoring righteousness.’

“Clean Money—But the difficulty is in determining what is immoral money. Can there be any description of immoral money which will cover a part of the money and not include the rest. Ethics, from the workingmen's standpoint, insists that there is no justice in an exchange

which does not mean an equal service for an equal service. Ethics from the standpoint of the business world insists that it is not only a righteous thing to get something for nothing, but if one gets a good deal of something for a very little of nothing, it is an evidence of character and of divine favor, instead of an evidence of wrong doing. The difference between honest money and dishonest money, from a business standpoint, if such a distinction is to be drawn at all, would probably be that one must not take too much of something for too little of nothing; that it is both inhuman and unprofitable to skin the lambs as well as take their wool."—Saturday Evening Tribune, Seattle, Wash.

GOV. ALTGELD'S OPTIMISM.

(Peroration of a speech delivered in Chicago by John P. Altgeld in 1900.)

But, says one, is there any use in our making an effort? Are not all the banks of this country, all of the trusts and great corporations of this country, is not the fashion of this country, are not the drawing rooms and the clubs of this country now controlled by concentrated and corrupt wealth? Are they not growing stronger every year, and do they not villify and attempt to corrupt everybody that does not submit? Can anything be accomplished in the way of curbing this great force and protecting the American people?

My friends, let me cite you a parallel. George W. Curtis and other writers of his day, have described the slave power back in the '50's. They tell us that slavery sat in the White House and made laws in the capitol, that courts of justice were its ministers, that senators and legislators were its lackeys; that it controlled the professor in his lecture room, the editor in his sanctum, the preacher in his pulpit, that it swaggered in the drawing room; that it ruled at the clubs; that it dominated with iron hand all the affairs of society; that every year enlarged its power, every move increased its dominion; that the men and women who dared even to question the divinity of that institution were ostracized, were persecuted, were villified—aye, were hanged.

But the great clock in the chamber of the Omnipotent never stands still. It ticked away the years as it had once ticked away the centuries. Finally it struck the hour, and the world heard the tread of a million armed men, and slavery vanished from America forever. Note the parallel. To-day the syndicate rules at the White House and makes laws in the capitol, courts of justice are its ministers, senators and legislators are its lackeys. It controls the preacher in his pulpit, the professor in his lecture room, the editor in his sanctum; it swaggers in the drawing room, it rules at the clubs, it dominates with a rod of iron the affairs of society. Every year enlarges its power, and the men and women who protest against crimes that are committed by organized greed in this country—who talk of protecting the American people, are ostracized, are villified, are hounded and imprisoned. It seems madness even to question the divinity of the American syndicate. But my friends, the great clock is still ticking—is still ticking. Soon it will strike the hour, and the world will see, not one million, but ten million free men rise up armed, not with muskets, but with freemen's ballots, and the sway of the syndicate will vanish from America forever.

Miscellaneous Observations of the Author.

I. **Equality Through Capitalistic Glasses.** Charles J. Bonaparte, Attorney-General of the United States, is reported to have delivered a lecture on "Socialism and Charity," in Carnegie Hall, New York, recently, being introduced by Arch-

bishop Farley, as "the first Catholic citizen of the United States," and to have said, in part:

"As I have said on another occasion, the root of Socialism is the doctrine that all men are of right and ought to be, and should therefore be made and kept precisely equal."

The first emotion that arises in the mind of the Socialist on reading this assertion is apt to be that of indignation; and, unless he has learned self-control pretty well, the first impulse will be to denounce it as a palpable falsehood; and next he will feel very much ashamed of himself when he comes to consider the matter and sees that the man is simply mistaken; and that the mistake is perfectly natural for anyone to make who looks through capitalistic glasses. Under capitalism, wealth is everything; it has become the god, the all in all.

Under capitalism wealth is the only thing that is substantial. True, there is one other thing that has been much talked of, but it is a mere nothing; or at least it is not a substance, unless Wilford Hall's theory of the substantial nature of sound be the true one. I refer to what we call "rights," personal rights," "Equal and inalienable rights." Under capitalism, these all consist of pure sound and nothing else.

For a hundred years "equality" has been flaunted to the breeze and greeted with cheers. That was all right so long as it remained in the air; but now, since it has been proposed to bring it into contact with things mundane it has suddenly become a thing to be loathed and execrated. Now, the only place for equality is in the air. Capitalism is now sorry, no doubt, that it was ever admitted, even there; and if the present so-called danger had been foreseen, it is safe to say that steps would have been taken to cut it out of the air. So much of it, however, has accumulated in the air, that it is now too late to cut it out. It is rapidly pressing down to the earth in spite of all the thunders of capitalism against it.

Capitalism knows no distinction among people except that of wealth. If there should come along seven men, all possessing exactly a million dollars' worth of property, one a plain, uneducated farmer of the old style, with a million dollars' worth of land and stock and wheat; another a great and learned preacher with a million dollars' worth of bibles; another a great college president with a million dollars' worth of Standard Oil stocks; another a great merchant with a million dollars invested in merchandise; another a "red light" keeper with a million dollars invested in houses of ill fame; another a great distiller with a million dollars' worth of whiskey; and another a blind idiot with a million dollars' worth of jewsharps, if these should all come walking down the street side by side capitalism would

swear, with its hand on the whole stack of the preacher's bibles, that these seven men are all alike, just like seven peas.

2. **The Red Flag.** It is interesting to contemplate the impression that many people have of the red flag, the peculiar effect it has upon some and the treatment it receives from them.

It is also curiously interesting to note the successive emotions that fill our own minds during such contemplation. Mirth, pity and disgust are all jumbled together as we see the capitalists enraged, storming and bellowing like a mad bull at the sight of a red rag. This is likely to be succeeded by more indignation and resentment than is best for us when we behold the ruthless, forcible suppression of labor's chosen peaceful emblem by the police and military, as though it were the most dangerous thing imaginable. Finally, we are, or should be, filled with charity for the masses who are deceived by the capitalist press into believing that the red flag means fight, bloodshed, violence, anarchy, devastation and destruction; who do not know that it has been the emblem of labor from time immemorial, and that the significance of the color is international and therefore peaceful, suggesting that all nations should be united in one brotherhood, since the blood of all is alike, all red.

3. **Mother's Wish.** As an illustration of the ruthlessness of capitalism a little while ago I read what was given out as an argument against Socialism, in which the writer evidently thought he was making a great hit by saying that under Socialism the most valuable property would consist of old plate, family pictures, etc.

About the same time the unfeeling and cold-hearted ruthlessness of this species of argument was pressed home to me in a personal incident. While engaged in conversation with an old woman of four score, she said, "Frank, I wish we had the pictures of the three little ones that died." And I said, "Yes, Mother, and after a while it will be so that people may not only see the pictures of their loved ones but may also hear their voices."

But capitalism laughs at our dear mother's fond memory of fifty years and more. "What! No profits in that!" Capitalism does not hesitate to outrage all the tender and sympathetic ties which people hold so dear and sacred. From its point of view it is of but little consequence if in the past most people could not afford, or could little afford to give attention to these things; but Socialism, on the contrary, will make the most ample provision for them. Under Socialism it need no longer be that all the sacred tenderness of human nature, all those refined impulses of the human breast, all that tends most to bring heaven to earth, must be choked out.

4. **Around the Square.** The tactics of the opposition to Socialism is the most cowardly that could be imagined. It is a continually running fight. It is substantially something like this: A modern capitalistic stump orator mounts a box on the corner of a great public square and, beginning with the assertion that we have the best government in the world, expatiates verbosely and grandiloquently upon the glories of our present society, saying, among other things, that if one isn't happy it is his own fault, he is lazy, etc., etc.

Hearing this a doughty Socialist elbows his way through the crowd, mounts another box near by and does capitalism to a finish.

When he is through the first orator, having fled at the first charge, now starts up on the next corner, but with a changed attitude. He now admits that capitalism is not what it ought to be: In fact he admits all the Socialist said concerning the rottenness of capitalism. He admits the necessity of reform and says that something must be done and that quickly, or we are liable to go to the dogs; and then drawing himself up to his full height and stretching forth his hand to suit the word, he warns his hearers to "look out for the Socialist! Socialism is dishonest! Socialism is robbery! Socialism is anarchism!"

Immediately our faithful Socialist works his way to this corner, and mounting the box from which the first orator has just retreated, now proceeds in a defense of Socialism and completely demolishes the position of his antagonist who is now heard on the next corner saying that Socialism is all right in principle and would be a grand thing if we could only make it work; but that it can never be made to work; that it is too big a thing; is utterly impracticable.

Then he flees as our plodding Socialist appears and shows up the impracticability of capitalism and the practicability of Socialism in so glowing a light that the air is rent with cheer after cheer as he proceeds to the next corner where his opponent is telling the people that Socialism is bound to come and will be a great blessing to the human race, but that they must be patient, for that it will take time to bring about so great a change, and charging them to be sure and have nothing to do with the present Socialist Party; that it is in bad hands, being made up for the most part of laborites who are practically all anarchists.

This last as he flees on the approach of the Socialist, who now proceeds in a telling manner to defend labor from all the aspersions that have been hurled against it. He closes: and, as he mops the perspiration from his face, there rings out from the first corner through the stillness of the night this same voice, saying, "Labor is all right. The Unions are all right. The only trouble is that unionism is becoming ensnared by, and entangled

with, the wicked and criminal doctrines of Socialism. Socialism is dishonest! Socialism is robbery! Socialism is anarchy!"

Then the Socialist looks plagued. He says, "It makes me tired. I don't see any use following that idiot any further."

5. The Test of a True Socialist. Many politicians there be who will shed great crocodile tears and put up a great wail, saying that "something must be done to relieve the miseries of the oppressed;" and that we are going to have "Socialism or something like it." Heed them not; they are hypocrites and seek to deceive you.

And there are many rich who have genuine sympathy for the poor, (genuine as far as it goes) who would like to see the poor made comfortable, but stumble at the word equality, and go away sorrowful, for they have great possessions.

But he who would be a true Socialist must be ready to cast all that he has in the Socialistic jack pot and take share and share alike with other people.

6. How to Destroy Socialism. I have heard or read something, somewhere, sometime, I do not now recall just what nor where nor when, that suggests this thought:

Satan collects about him a number of his most trusted followers and discourses to them as follows: "My most loyal subjects; I have called you together in order to consult with you about a matter of the most stupendous importance to you as well as to me, one in which the very foundations of this great kingdom are seriously threatened.

Behold a new enemy has come down from heaven. Have you not observed the spread of Socialism all over the whole face of the earth? A mere spark at first, it has become a great flame. Already its adherents number their hosts by millions, and unless something is done to stay its progress it must soon sweep the earth.

And do you know what this means? Ah, my dear demons, it is not alone for myself that I am concerned, but when I look upon you I am deeply moved for your sakes. My heart is filled with sorrow and sadness when I reflect that if this great enemy is not checked, the time must soon come when, as we stalk about amid the nocturnal shades and in the dark places of earth, you shall no more be permitted the inestimable pleasure of beholding the innumerable scenes of poverty, squalor, misery and degradation which now furnish you such intense satisfaction; no more shall mingle in the rapturous orgies of the intoxicating bowl, and no more dance with demoniacal delight on the gory field, wallowing in the blood of its mangled victims, mocking the groans of the dying and laughing hysterically at the indescribable scenes of carnage and ruin.'

Upon this there was a confused clamor mingled with many

hisses and a great wail which ceased instantly at a signal from the throne, when his majesty again spoke in measured tones which indicated somewhat of reproof, saying:

"It has never been any part of the policy of this kingdom to give up in despair until every device of devilish ingenuity has been resorted to. I confess that I have been put to my wit's end in trying to determine what is the best to do in the present case and I have called you together because I realize that in the multitude of counsel there is wisdom, and because I remember what effective service some of you have rendered in the past by your discreet advice. And now let us put away all excitement, all haste, and let us call our wits about us and, after careful consideration, let each one who has somewhat to offer rise and speak."

After a short pause a monstrous, ill-looking old fiend arose, and with a sinister grin on his savage and wrinkled countenance said, "Send me. I will go out among men and enlist every opponent of Socialism in a great army that shall encompass the earth; and I will make a great slaughter over all the face of the earth, which shall not cease so long as there is a single Socialist left alive."

And then, with murderous and vindictive frown upon his face he resumed his seat. Whereupon there was a great shout, which, when it had subsided, was succeeded by the following from the throne:

"My most valiant and renowned fiend: I cannot but be filled with admiration at thy old time, wonted, vindictive determination. It is with the greatest satisfaction that I recall thy valiant service during the centuries past; how thou didst stir up men to butcher and destroy each other; but alas! those palmy days are gone, gone never more to return, I fear. Gladly would I adopt the plan thou dost propose, but it will no longer work. Sad as it is to us, we cannot evade the conclusion that a change has come about among the people of earth. With all their selfishness and other faults by which we reap so great satisfaction, there is now more of sympathy and less of fierceness. Men are not so bloodthirsty as in those grand old days of yore. If thou shouldst essay to do as thou hast said, before one-thousandth part were slain public sympathy would turn the tide; the number of our enemies would be greatly multiplied and our cause would be lost. The plan thou dost propose was all right in its day, but times have changed. We must now seek a plan that is more up to date."

To this there was a general assent, in which, however, a considerable degree of dejection was apparent. After a little pause another fiend arose and spoke as follows:

"I would go among the men of earth and by eloquence and

specious argument would seek to stay the onward sweep of Socialism. I would exhaust all the arts of oratory and sophistry to convince them that Socialism is impracticable and that if it could be made successful it would be but a scheme of wholesale robbery."

And then warming up with his subject, his countenance beaming with intelligence and an appearance of honesty and candor, he launched into a tirade of eloquence which fairly shook the walls. And again there was a great shout and long continued cheering.

When this had subsided his majesty spoke as follows:

"There was a time when the methods thou proposest were very successful in the grand work of deceiving men, but Socialism has already been sowing the seeds of truth, and the light that is springing up is more than we are able to cope with. We must look for some other plan."

After a long while a little fiend arose and said:

"I would go and sow the seeds of discord, I would tell those Christians who are favorable to Socialism that the present Socialist Party is made up of atheists, infidels, anarchists and, in fact, the riff-raff of society: and I would stir up the spirit of proscription till half the members were read out of the party."

At this his majesty arose and, stretching forth his sceptre, said: "Go, my little fiend, go! Go out upon the earth, and my most Beelzebubic blessings go with thee! If thou art successful, as I hope thou mayst be, my kingdom may endure for a thousand years to come."

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS

WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN
THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY
WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH
DAY AND TO \$1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY
OVERDUE.

AUG 29 1944

MAY 1 1945

OCT 22 1946

JAN 10 1947

MAR 27 1947

MAY 7 1948

70% W/SC

YB 07799

M151389

HX 86

E2

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

